



1970

An Analysis of the Principal's Role as Middle Management in Selected Schools in Cook County

Edward Thomas Rancic

Loyola University Chicago

Recommended Citation

Rancic, Edward Thomas, "An Analysis of the Principal's Role as Middle Management in Selected Schools in Cook County" (1970).
Dissertations. Paper 1050.
http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/1050

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).

Copyright © Edward Thomas Rancic

AN ANALYSIS OF THE PRINCIPAL'S ROLE AS
MIDDLE MANAGEMENT IN SELECTED
SCHOOLS IN COOK COUNTY

by

Edward Thomas Rancic

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of Loyola University
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of Doctor of Education

1970

LIFE

Edward Thomas Rancic was born in Chicago, Illinois, on August 20, 1933.

He was graduated from St. Rita High School, Chicago. In December 1955, he was awarded the Bachelor of Arts degree from Denver University and served in the United States Army from 1956 to 1958. He was awarded the Master of Education degree in June, 1965, from Loyola University, Chicago.

From 1958 to 1965, the author taught mathematics, science, and physical education for the Oak Lawn school system, Oak Lawn, Illinois. In 1965, he was appointed principal of Kolmar Elementary School, Oak Lawn.

The author has contributed to an article, "Principal's Problem," The Instructor, (March, 1968), 27.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to acknowledge his gratitude to the many persons who made this study possible. He is indebted to his colleagues in the Oak Lawn-Hometown school system for their cooperation, and to fellow principals of southwest suburban Cook County who participated in this study. He is further indebted to members of his committee, Dr. Jasper J. Valenti and Dr. James H. Smith.

A special thank you to the author's chairman and advisor, Dr. Melvin P. Heller, for his assistance, encouragement and most of all his friendship during the author's tenure at Loyola.

Finally, he is most thankful for the patience and understanding of his wife, Gail.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIFE	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of Study	
Method and Procedure	
Limitations and Delimitations	
Definition of Terms	
II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED RESEARCH	16
III. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE PRINCIPALSHIP AND CURRENT AFFECTING FORCES	32
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	55
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	119
Conclusions	
Recommendations	
Suggestions for Further Study	
APPENDIX A	124
APPENDIX B	131
BIBLIOGRAPHY	133

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Recent events in public school education have brought about a rapid change in the role of the principal. Collective negotiations, decentralization, integration and student militancy have created problems largely unforeseen a decade ago.

John H. Langer, Assistant Professor, Oakland University, indicates in an article that principals are indeed today "in the middle." Understandably, principals are attempting to discern and clarify their role in these changing times. Sheer survival, too, plays some part in these attempts. Principals appear to be confused and concerned about the role to be allotted to them. The principal's role as the educational leader should be clear to everyone including the principal.¹

According to Professor John D. McAulay, Pennsylvania State University,

¹ John H. Langer, "The Emerging Principalship in Michigan", Phi Delta Kappan, XLVIII, No. 4, December, 1966, p. 161.

The elementary school principal today is in a dilemma. What is his function in the total school organization? Does he sit on the side of the school board and superintendent, simply a "link" between line and staff? Or is he more than a link, contributing to the decisions that will structure and govern his school?²

McAulay continues to say that the elementary principal's responsibility is the education of children. He is not a repairman, bookkeeper or glad-hander. What greater challenge can one have than to make learning experiences meaningful and useful for today's children. Meeting this challenge is a must for the principal if he expects to live and flourish as an educator in these changing times. If he does not, his function will wither and die.

Dr. James H. Smith, former Deputy Superintendent of Schools, Chicago, in a recent article concerning the principal's position indicated a considerable change has taken place over the years. At one time a principal could consider himself a "king in his castle" providing he maintained a good relationship with his administrative superiors.³

²John D. McAulay, "The Elementary Principal: Anachronism or What?", Education Age, March-April, 1969, p. 10.

³James H. Smith, "The Principalship--Past, Present, and Future", The Chicago Principals Club Reporter, LVII, No. 4, Summer, 1968, p. 5.

Today, teachers are not concerned about whether or not the principal is a king. What has enabled him to survive has been his leadership, knowledge, human relations techniques and personality.⁴

According to Smith, "Just being principal is not enough, the position itself does not have its old power."⁵

The position of the principal appears to be well known; however, the role of the principal is not always so clearly understood. Several reasons are given for this, particularly at the elementary school level. The expectations of school boards and superintendents regarding the elementary school principal vary greatly among school districts. Until recently there has been no general agreement on educational requirements for the position. The many small districts which characterize the American scene have not been conducive to a well-planned administrative structure and to adequate role definitions of the administrative position.⁶

⁴
Ibid., p. 11.

⁵
Ibid., p. 12.

⁶
Illinois Elementary School Principals Association,
"The Role of the Elementary School Principal", September, 1965,
p. 3.

An article by Dr. Joseph H. Cronin, Assistant Professor, Harvard University, indicates the school principalship in America is reaching a critical point. The principal will take one of two courses; instructional leadership or continue to travel further onward toward the role of building manager. If the latter is selected, the role of the principalship could dissolve to that of master technician who will be tolerated by teachers as the man in charge of keys, custodians, and "kids" in trouble.⁷

On many occasions, the principal is placed in a difficult situation when he finds himself between the status quo and the whirlpool of change. Persistent and compelling social forces exert a potent influence upon the administration and supervision of schools. At the federal and state levels there are legislation and court decisions that tend to make inroads upon the management of education in this country.

The state is the legal authority for education. There is no provision in the Constitution that states this, but the

⁷ Joseph H. Cronin, "School Board and Principals--Before and After Negotiations", Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX, No. 3, November, 1967, p. 123.

Tenth Amendment infers that education is the state's responsibility. The reason for this omission is due to the fact that education was thought to be a state function during the time of the constitutional conventions. Through the years the courts have informally held that education is essentially a state function. There is no national law setting requirements on education. The state constitutions provide a structure and method of operation for the educational system.

The federal government has no direct control or authority in the field of public education. The Ordinances of 1785 and 1787 were one of the first forms of federal aid and indirect control. Congress in each of its education acts, also by failing to act, exerts control over education. Congressional action or inaction does not have to be designated explicitly as "educational" in order to exert profound effects. Legislation on the beginning age of required military service, for example, or legislation about the "war on poverty" or legislation in the areas of civil rights may have more effects on educational policy than legislation which is called educational.

The Supreme Court establishes federal educational policy through its interpretation of the Constitution. A recent example would be the desegregation order of 1954.

Many principals are not aware of the fact that their future job descriptions are being written by state legislatures, via collective negotiations laws. This is a time of concern for principals because initial state legislation on negotiations set the pattern for the long term. In some states, laws are being formulated that will inhibit the principal and even make it impossible for him to have representation.

Fenwick English, Administrative Assistant, Temple City Unified School District, California, says principals must understand that many of the urgent reforms of public education mean changing the bureaucratic structure to allow it to respond to societal pressures. On the one hand they find themselves cheering for teachers as they battle for better working conditions and pay; on the other hand, they are deeply concerned about their own position in the struggle. If principals continue to withdraw towards entrenched positions, and away from teacher demands to be involved in the decision-making process, they fall into the trap of defending the status quo and abandon all claims for leadership. By refusing to change, they preserve the rigor mortis of the educational bureaucracy.

English continues by saying one of the greatest shocks to principals has been the fact that they have been left out of

the negotiating process. In their absence, new links of power have been formed within the educational structure. Principals have experienced a severe psychological blow by discovering that they have become impotent. Instead of forging new organizational links that would strengthen and enhance their leadership, principals have fought for legal sanctions by polishing up negotiation procedures to preserve their positions. Principals are severing their partnership with teachers and run the risk of becoming obsolete. One cannot lead by isolating himself from his constituents and the issues of the day.

Teachers are challenging the administrative hierarchy states English, by their nationwide strikes and resignations. Teachers do this because they are unable to influence and initiate change or be considered as partners in the deliberations of new policy or programs. A new link of power could emerge that would consist of a straight line relationship to boards of education and state legislatures which will neutralize the administration.⁸

⁸Fenwick English, "The Ailing Principalship", Phi Delta Kappan, L, No. 3, November, 1968, pp. 158-60.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine through comparison and analysis the changing role of the principal as prominent educators and principals see the role of middle management emerging. An attempt will be made to clarify the position of the principals and to take a broader look at the role of the principal in view of the trends affecting education today.

Much of the literature today is authored by professors, department chairmen, deans of graduate schools, superintendents and assistant superintendents. It appears that many feelings are being expressed about the changing world of the principal but little is being written or expressed by the principals themselves.

The need for a definitive study to assess the perceptions of elementary school principals is apparent from the lack of literature on the subject by principals. The role of the elementary school principal will continually undergo much modification during the next decade, and a redefinition of the role is foreseen in the future.

Method and Procedure

This study is based on six hypotheses derived from an analysis of current professional literature (see Appendix B):

- I. Principals will find it necessary to organize in order to combat the power plays of others and shape their own destiny.
- II. Principals today feel they no longer assist in developing policy, but boards of education, superintendents, teacher organizations and parents "call the plays."
- III. Principals today feel they are in a "no-man's-land" in regard to their roles.
- IV. Principals will lose effectiveness unless they become partners with teachers in the shaping of school policies.
- V. Principals will be likely to avoid exercising authority in advising and evaluating teachers because teachers are becoming more expert in their field.
- VI. Principals will have to establish professional competence in order to assume the role of educational leader.

The propositions developed to test the hypotheses were formulated by the author after reviewing the literature and related research. (See Appendix A.) The hypotheses and questions were tested by fellow students and principals from the Chicago and Oak Lawn school systems. Trial runs were instituted and revisions made accordingly.

The interview method used for this study was designed to test the six hypotheses of this study and therefore was conducted with a structured purpose. Each interviewee was asked certain questions, the responses to which were weighted to place him in a general category of reactions. The questions fall into six categories, each related to the primary purpose of the study which attempts to determine what role the principal will play in the future.

The sample of principals was taken randomly from southwest suburban Cook County. This area has had and is continuing to experience rapid growth and expansion. It has had its share of parent pressure groups, a taste of racial problems, student unrest on a small scale, and a good deal of influence exerted by teacher unions. Thirty elementary school principals were interviewed, representing ten districts, encompassing an area of approximately seventy-five square miles. The smallest district has a student population of fifteen hundred in three attendance centers and the largest district has a student population of six thousand in ten attendance centers.

Ten districts of varying sizes were visited. Three had a student population of 2000 or less, four had a student

population between 2000 and 4000, and three had a student population of over 4000. The number of principals interviewed from each category were nine, twelve, and nine, respectively.

It is the author's desire that this study will be beneficial by focusing attention on some of the forces such as collective negotiations, decentralization, integration and student militancy that influence the principalship and how modification of this role is needed to cope with these forces. Those aspects of the study which reveal positive directions principals should take will serve as a valuable guide in the shaping of their new role. The weaknesses and inconsistencies that will be pointed out should serve as a guide in avoiding the common failings of the principal.

Limitations and Delimitations

Limitations of the study would be the ones that are inherent in the interview method itself. Although there are limitations with the interview method, it is a desirable method to use when perceptions and their values are being examined. The ability to probe vague responses and cross-check suspect reactions are advantages of the personal interview. One condition that tends to mitigate bias depends upon the

interviewer's insight into the respondent's situation. In this study, the interviewer is part of the same profession as the respondents. He has developed insights into the conditions under which the respondents work and is concerned about the problems similar to those which the respondents face. He is not alien to the role of the respondents, being in fact employed in the same general capacity for some years. In no way could it be conceived that the respondent's situation was totally unfamiliar to the interviewer.

A further limitation of the interview method concerns the employment of a common vocabulary with the respondents and an understanding of the framework within which the respondents operate. Since the interviewer in this research is of the same profession as the respondents, the limitations cited were of no consequence.

This study is delimited to public elementary school principals who are considered full time principals. It is further delimited by the fact that it confines itself to southwest suburban Cook County.

Definition of Terms

By prominent educators, reference is made to college

and university professors teaching in the Department of Education, Education Department chairmen, College of Education deans, Graduate School deans, superintendents and assistant superintendents of large districts. Another distinguishing factor is that the people listed above have all had articles published relating to this study (see Appendix B).

Getzels defines roles in terms of role expectations, "the normative rights and duties which define within limits what a person should or should not do under various circumstances so long as he is the incumbent of a particular institutional role."⁹ Role expectations are held not only by the role incumbent himself, but also by significant others. The individual's on-the-job behavior will be judged effective if it meets with the role expectations held by others.

Role as defined by Linton is "the dynamic aspect of a position, office, or status within an institution."¹⁰

The term "middle management" is being employed to depict

⁹ Jacob W. Getzels, "Administration as a Social Process", in Administrative Theory in Education, ed. by Andrew W. Halpin (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1958), p. 153.

¹⁰ Ralph Linton, The Study of Man (New York: Appleton-Century Co., 1936), p. 14.

the principal as the "man in the middle." Principals are currently experiencing frustration and intense concern as a result of the erosion of "position derived" power, says Fred D. Carver. Because of an increase in scope and depth of superordinate power from the top down, and an increase in subordinate power from the bottom up, the man in the middle, the principal, is being maneuvered into a state of suspended animation.

Central office positions are increasing in number and specialization. Assistant superintendents, directors, coordinators, supervisors and consultants are reducing the principal's role by assuming more responsibility for recruitment, selection, assignment, orientation, evaluation and promotion of teachers, curriculum development, and budget management.

Teachers are playing a greater role in determining working conditions, assignments of teachers and the procedure by which decisions are reached. Again, this serves to reduce the size of the position variable since teachers in many cases deal directly with the board and superintendent, often without the principal being consulted. This erosion of power is what principals and professors of educational administration

mean when they speak of attrition of the principal's role.¹¹

As a middle manager, the principal is not being provided with power and authority commensurate with his responsibilities. The principal, being squeezed from both sides, is becoming more of a persuader than authority leader. Some say the principal is simply a link between staff and line, no longer making important decisions.

¹¹ Fred D. Carver, "Eroding Power Bases of the School Principal", Illinois Elementary Principal, May, 1969, p. 11-12.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED RESEARCH

A number of studies have been conducted regarding the role of the principal. Many of these studies are concerned with the ideal and actual role perceptions of principals; others deal with the role of the principal as perceived by various groups, such as, superintendents, principals, teachers, and board members.

One study that has the most direct relationship was conducted by Muse in 1966. He proposed to determine and compare the prime responsibilities and role expectations of the principalship as viewed by principals and selected alternate groups.

The sample included 678 individuals consisting of principals, teachers, supervisors, undergraduate and graduate students taking education courses, interns of administrative training programs, and professors of Educational Administration.

The instruments for the study were the Responsibility Check List used to provide information about the prime

responsibilities assigned to the principalship by principals and alternate groups, and the Episode Situation Questionnaire, which provided an analysis of the groups as to their orientation (nomothetic, ideographic, transactional) toward the role of the principalship.

Muse concluded that principals and alternate groups were in general agreement regarding the assignment of prime responsibility to the principalship. A major difference was noted in the curriculum area where principals, teachers, and supervisors were found to be particularly divergent in their assignment of responsibility. A number of significant differences were found to exist between principals and alternate groups in the role expectations held for the principalship. Principals were found to be somewhat nomothetically oriented while the alternate groups indicated a preference for the principalship position to be slightly ideographically oriented.

Muse recommends an evaluation, upgrading and extension of university courses offered to undergraduates that will better orient them to the principal's responsibilities and function in the school organization.

Muse indicates principals should seek more effective ways of helping new teachers better understand the management

aspects of school operations and responsibilities of the principalship.¹

Snyder's study in 1968 examined the perceptions of elementary school principals relating to their ideal and actual roles and analyzed the differences.

In the areas of curriculum and instructional leadership, personnel guidance, and evaluation responsibility, there was little difference between the principal's ideal and actual role; the principals indicated their ideal role was significantly different from their actual role in respect to school community relations; in the area of administrative responsibility, the principals indicated that some of the tasks actually performed were significantly different from those perceived as being more important; the principals indicated that they were performing tasks in the area of professional improvement which they did not consider to be the most important tasks.

The principals suggested that an internship program be developed for future principals emphasizing human relations. The principal should devote more time to the curriculum and

¹Ivan David Muse, "The Public School Principalship: Role Expectations by Alternate Groups" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Utah, 1966).

instructional leadership. Additional personnel should be employed at the central office level to handle some of the administrative detail.²

Latimer in 1966 examined the role of the principal as perceived by faculty and principals through selected role behaviors. His review of the literature indicated that the perceptions of the principal's role are frequently dissimilar. This study attempted to discover if such discrepancies in perception of roles did, in fact, exist. The intent of this study was to provide more information about principal-faculty perceptions of the principal's role.

The statistical findings indicated that there was correlation between the principal's valuation and his teachers' valuations of the behavior roles of the elementary school principal.

It was evident that the principal and his teachers were in general agreement in assessing the roles of the principal in the major responsibility areas of improving the educational

²Willard Shields Snyder, "The Elementary School Principal's Perception of His Ideal and Actual Role" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, United States International University, 1968).

program, selecting and developing personnel, and managing the school.

It was concluded that the responsibility area, working with the community, is the least well understood between the principal and his faculty.³

A study by Thompson attempted to examine the effects of school district unification on the principalship. Unification brings about many changes for the elementary school principal. It was the purpose of this study to determine whether the role of the elementary school principal changes when districts unify.

It was found that unification generally brings about improvement in all aspects of the educational program. Principals favored unification. Secondary school personnel felt superior to the elementary people and also thought the elementary level was draining off monies which were rightfully theirs.

With unification, principals will (1) have more responsibility for administering and supervising their school,

³Francis Lowell Latimer, "The Role of the Elementary School Principal as Perceived by the Faculty and Principal through Selected Role Behaviors" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Dakota, 1966).

(2) receive a salary increase, (3) in medium districts experience a greater increase in services to principals and teachers, (4) experience a considerable increase in paper flow from district office, (5) find general improvement in all aspects of the educational program, (6) have less influence on developing district policy, (7) have no need to fear unification.⁴

A study conducted by Morgan is similar to the one conducted by Muse in that it examined the expectations of relevant groups with regard to the principal's role.

Teachers, principals, superintendents, and board of education members participated in the study. Like Muse, Morgan used the Responsibility Check List and the Episode Situation Questionnaire.

Responsibilities of the principalship were considered under five categories: administrative, extension of board of education authority, curriculum, personnel, and management. In all of these, except curriculum, the principalship was assigned a major role with extensive prime responsibilities.

⁴ Lloyd Robert Thompson, "Principals' Perceptions of Changes in Their Role Resulting from Unification" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, 1966).

The instructional leadership role of the principal was questioned by the findings of Morgan's study. The groups that participated, with the exception of the principals, did not view the principalship as having prime responsibility in this area.

The following hypotheses were tested by Morgan's study:

- I. The role of the principalship is recognized as separate and apart from that of the teacher.
- II. There are different patterns of responsibility and authority for the principal and the teacher.
- III. Patterns of responsibility are commonly recognized by the referent group even though differences may exist in the interpretation of the manner in which the role is carried out.
- IV. Superintendents and board of education members as superiors will indicate a nomothetic preference of the principalship.
- V. Principals as coordinates and teachers as subordinates will more generally reveal an idiographic preference toward the principalship.

The first three hypotheses were validated by the study, but hypotheses four and five were not substantiated.⁵

Petrie investigated the discrepancies between role expectations and the decisions principals make when presented

⁵ Stanley Roy Morgan, "The Public School Principalship: Role Expectations by Relevant Groups" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Utah, 1965).

with simulated problem situations related to accepted expectations.

Through the use of two instruments mailed to elementary principals, comparisons were made of the expectations and decisions of each principal. A comparison was also made between the principals' responses and a panel of experts.

The following statements were formulated based on an analysis of the data accumulated with the instruments.

1. The amount of professional preparation was found to be significantly related.
2. Principals whose scores were in the most favorable category were persons with an elementary undergraduate major.
3. Principals had difficulty in recognizing the importance of factors that were exerting influence on their decisions.

Principals in the elementary schools had difficulty recognizing and interpreting their role expectations. They also experienced difficulty identifying influencing factors upon their decisions. Principals with more professional preparation, graduate work at the university rather than a college, and an undergraduate major in elementary education

demonstrated a greater degree of consistency between role expectation and role enactment.⁶

A second study discovered in reviewing the research dealing with actual and ideal roles was conducted by Crotts in 1963. His purpose was to compare and analyze concepts of elementary principals, superintendents, and teachers.

The Q-sort was used to collect the data. This device was composed of fifty statements selected to cover the realm of the principal's function. Fifty principals, thirty superintendents, and 100 teachers were used in the study.

The correlation between the actual and ideal roles of principals as perceived by principals was .61; as perceived by superintendents, .59; and as perceived by teachers, .77.

Principals and superintendents did not perceive a high degree of relationship between the actual and ideal roles of principals. Teachers perceived a high relationship between the actual and ideal roles of principals. The degree of relationship among the groups of the perceptions of the

⁶ Garth F. Petrie, "A Study of the Elementary Administrator's Role in Terms of the Existing Discrepancies between Role Expectations and Role Behavior" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1965).

principal's actual function was not high, although the relationship was positive.

The ideal role of the principal as perceived by principals differs with respect to: (1) number of administrative and supervisory personnel who work with the elementary principal, (2) number of teachers employed in the building, (3) number of years of elementary teaching experience of the principal, (4) number of college hours possessed by the principal, and (5) number of elementary pupils enrolled in the school system.⁷

Fearing's study of principal-faculty perceptions focused around certain common and observable role behaviors. Fearing felt there was a great need for a definitive study to assess interpersonal perceptions because of the apparent lack of literature on the subject. This study sought to discover what relationships existed among faculty and principal perceptions of certain common and observable elementary school principal role behaviors. It was hoped that by doing this an avenue toward increased teaching satisfaction and productivity would open.

⁷ John H. Crotts, "Comparison and an Analysis of the Concepts of the Role of the Elementary School Principal" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Missouri, 1963).

Each principal and faculty sorted the behaviors twice--according to how they valued the behaviors and believed the other valued the behaviors.

This study produced results which indicated that principal and faculty perceptions of principal role behavior were frequently dissimilar, with perceptions being similar from one-third to one-half of the time.

Fearing concluded that interpersonal perceptions must be similar for the efficient functioning of cooperative systems.⁸

Seymour attempted to ascertain the ideal and actual curriculum role conceptions of elementary school principals. He compared these conceptions to determine whether practice was significantly different from expressed ideals.

Suggestions as to the best curriculum role for an elementary school principal were drawn from the writings of authorities in the fields of school administration and curriculum development. The suggestions were then used to

⁸ Joseph Lea Fearing, "Principal-Faculty Perceptions of Certain Common and Observable Role Behaviors of the Elementary School Principal" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Colorado State College, 1963).

prepare a description of a standard curriculum role against which conceptions of principals in this study could be compared.

Major findings of Seymour's study were:

1. Principals conceived their ideal role in curriculum development to be one of a democratic-participating leader.
2. The actual curriculum role which the principals in this study believed they were performing was significantly different from the ideal role that they supported.
3. The actual curriculum role which the principals in this study believed they were performing was most nearly that of a democratic-participating leader.

Most principals agreed that little in the way of formal curriculum study had been or was currently being carried out. An implication of this conclusion is that a definite need exists for new approaches to curriculum development which would bring neighboring small school districts together in cooperative curriculum study and development. It also seems probable that much of the necessary direction and effort for curriculum study must continue to come from central office personnel.⁹

⁹Harry J. Seymour, "A Study of Ideal and Actual Curriculum Role Conceptions of Selected Elementary School Principals from Southern Illinois" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1963).

A role analysis of the school principalship was conducted by Gray in 1961. The basic concept from which this study derives is that of the school as a social system. The term "social" being used conceptually rather than descriptively. Because administrators operate within an interpersonal or social relationship, the nature of this relationship becomes a crucial factor in the administrative process.

It was hypothesized in Gray's study that (1) there will be different amounts of consensus on different expectations for the principal position within and between teacher, principal, and central office staff positions, and (2) that the sex composition, degree status, level of instruction, and position experience of the teaching force will be determinants in role consensus. Both hypotheses were supported by the data of this study.

Implications arising from Gray's study are: (1) a major responsibility that faces the administrator is to reconcile the conflicting expectations placed on his position if he is to assure teacher satisfaction and harmonious working relationships with his staff, (2) the principal must be familiar with the characteristics of his teaching staff if he is to work for common understandings, cooperative action and satisfying

interaction relations among his staff, and (3) the principal must be continually alert to the role expectations as defined by his teachers so that he can reconcile these with his own perceptions of their role expectations.¹⁰

The most extensive and more recent study of the principalship was conducted by the Department of Elementary School Principals in 1968. The research was concerned with characteristics of principals, experience and preparation, working conditions and financial status.

On the basis of a random selection, 2,551 names were selected of elementary school principals throughout the United States. All school systems that participated in the study had student enrollments of at least 300 students. Two thousand three hundred thirty-nine questionnaires were returned for a per cent of 91.7.

Other areas researched dealt with the principal and administration, the principal and supervision, and principals' perceptions of special school programs. The following information is a summary of the facts revealed by the study.

¹⁰ Martin Gray, "A Role Analysis of the School Principalship" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1961).

The median age of elementary school principals was 46 years. Three out of four were men and eight out of ten were married. Six out of ten principals taught at the elementary level just prior to becoming principals. The median age at initial appointment was 33.

Two of the reasons given for becoming a principal were: (1) they considered the job important, (2) they were encouraged by the superintendent. Eight out of ten principals indicated they would become principals again if they had their careers to live over. Fifty-six per cent of the total sample looked upon the elementary school principalship as their final occupational goal, others desired a superintendency, director of elementary education, or a supervisory position at the central office level.

Of the total sample, 82 per cent attributed their success as principals to two types of experience: (1) Experience as classroom teachers, and (2) their on-the-job experience as principals. Fifty-two per cent thought that their central offices looked upon them as leaders; 42 per cent thought they were in the role of supporters; and 6 per cent as followers.¹¹

¹¹Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association, "The Elementary School Principalship in 1968".

This present study differs from the others in that it deals with how the principals view their roles changing in these turbulent times. All of the related studies dealt mainly with what the principal actually does on the job or what he should be doing. This present study will reveal how the principals feel their roles will be modified due to social pressures and social reform.

CHAPTER III

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE PRINCIPALSHIP AND CURRENT AFFECTING FORCES

This chapter reviews the elementary school principalship from its inception to today including a view of recent proposals. Suggested changes in the principal's responsibility along with a review of current forces affecting the role of the principal will follow.

During the first half of the nineteenth century, the term principal implied principal or head teacher. Since schools were small, a head teacher was able to handle routine matters which consisted of a few administrative duties. Supervising instruction and handling discipline were responsibilities assumed by the superintendent.

After 1830 many changes occurred. With the impetus of Jacksonian democracy, people became convinced that free public education was the way to equality of opportunity and social mobility. School enrollments soared with this new interest in education and the influx of immigrants to our country.

Since this increase in student population created new responsibilities, the principal could no longer cope with both students and administrative problems. Although one of the first solutions was to appoint several principals to one building, gradually one person from this group emerged as leader with the others serving as assistants. With the development of the graded school, the principalship became more unified; someone had to group the children appropriately and develop a course of study.¹

During the latter part of the nineteenth century, the administrative responsibilities of principals gradually changed from routine and clerical duties to the overall management of the schools. Because schools were increasing in size and complexity, the principal's role changed to that of directing manager rather than presiding teacher. By 1900, principals were recognized as the formal and sole intermediary between the teachers and the responsible administrative head of their schools.²

¹Jerome R. Reich, "The Principalship: A Brief History", in Perspectives on the Changing Role of the Principal, comp. by Richard W. Saxe, pp. 13-15.

²Neal Gross and Robert E. Herriot, Staff Leadership in Public Schools (New York, London, Sydney: John Wiley and Sons, 1965), pp. 1-5.

During the nineteen hundreds, the principalship was a position of great prestige. Unfortunately, Reich says, much of this prestige was undeserved and many of the principals failed to utilize the power derived from this prestige. Principals should have been serving as educational leaders; however, most were content to maintain their own authority and to preserve the educational status quo.³

The Seventh Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals divided the history of the elementary school principalship into five stages: (1) Teacher, (2) Head teacher, (3) Teaching principal, (4) Building principal, and (5) Supervising Principal. Some of the duties associated with the position are:

- I. Supervision
- II. Organization and Administration
- III. Clerical
- IV. Teaching
- V. Miscellaneous (Parent-teacher work--Community)⁴

³ Saxe, Changing Role of the Principal, pp. 16-17.

⁴ Department of Elementary School Principals, The Elementary School Principalship, Seventh Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals, 1938, p. 155.

Duties listed by Goodykoontz were: "classification of pupils, organization of classes, overseeing building arrangements, regulation of school hours, and other administrative problems."⁵

McClure compared existing practices of principals with functions he said were suggested by the best educational theory. The suggested functions were listed according to priority: "supervision of teaching, administration, community leadership, professional study and growth, and clerical work." McClure indicated principals' duties were falling considerably short of the ideal. According to him, administration received greatest principal attention, followed next by clerical work and by supervision.⁶

After the first World War, a new wave of professionalism upgraded the principalship with the founding of the Department of Elementary School Principals of the National Education Association in 1920. University departments of education were

⁵ U. S., Department of Interior, The Elementary School Principalship, by Bess Goodykoontz, Office of Education Bulletin 1938, No. 8 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, pp. 2-6.

⁶ Worth McClure, "The Functions of the Elementary School Principal", Elementary School Journal, XXI, 513.

offering training in educational administration and supervision. School boards were requiring candidates for the principalship to have requisite professional preparation.⁷

In retrospect, in the nineteenth century, two major requirements for the principalship were (1) good moral character and (2) the passing of an examination based on a textbook used in the school. By the turn of the century, candidates for the principalship had to have a knowledge of educational theory and practice. This raising of standards also increased the amount of formal education required of each candidate.

Saxe indicates two powerful forces affecting American education and the principalship--the Progressive Movement and the Scientific Movement. The former changed the autocratic principal into more of a counselor and child-guidance expert. The latter had an impact in that it emphasized psychological and achievement testing and school surveys. These two movements changed the principal from a man who ran his school by instinct and rule of thumb into a skilled educational practitioner.⁸

⁷ Saxe, Changing Role of the Principal, p. 16.

⁸ Ibid., p. 17.

The administrator may be many things to many people, but this may not be nearly as important as what he perceives himself to be. Many times principals perceive their positions as paternalistic ones. The principal trying to build up the importance of his position by occupying himself with endless bureaucratic rules and regulations which frustrate teachers may find himself threatened by upheaval.⁹

The essence of the principal's leadership is in his ability to create authority. Through his personality, a position of respect must be developed in the eyes of his staff and community.¹⁰ The principal will not have authority just because the board says he is the principal. The authority and his leadership role will have to be earned. True administrative leadership exists when the principal is accepted by his staff as their leader.¹¹

⁹ Paul Houts, "Professional Negotiations", National Elementary Principal, February, 1968, p. 65.

¹⁰ David Lewin, "The Changing Role of the Urban Principal", Elementary School Journal, April, 1968, p. 333.

¹¹ James J. Harmon, "The Principal's Role in a Changing Power Structure", School and Community, November, 1968, p. 45.

Green states that the principal's role is more complex than ever before. Some still hide behind the desk and stacks of paper, determined desk-bound administrators. The modern principal should see his role as that of a leader.

Green continues to say the job of the principal is one of many hats. In performing his duties to the profession, society, community, parents, administration, staff, and most important the child, he wears the hats of executive officer, coordinator, motivator, innovator, mediator, interpreter, supervisor, evaluator, advisor, professional "example" and prophet. He must be creative, practical, supportive and challenging as he aligns himself with all groups he contacts in daily living.¹²

Professor Donald A. Erickson of the University of Chicago indicates the instructional-supervision phase of the principal's responsibility for strategic coordination is given increasing emphasis. Eventually he will create and maintain through continuous analysis and revision the best school program that is possible in his community for the students his school must serve.

¹² Marion Green, "Elementary Principal's Job", School and Community, January, 1968, p. 10.

Erickson says teaching experience, competence in some academic field, and courses relating to the improvement of instruction will be less helpful to most principals in the future. It will be increasingly pertinent for principals to know, through exposure to such disciplines as psychology, social psychology, sociology, and social anthropology, and through courses in educational administration and curriculum, how the students and communities have come to be what they are, the consequences of various administrative procedures, and how best to design the total school program.

Should there be a failure to adapt, Erickson warns, there is a strong possibility the principal will be reduced to the status of local errand-boy for the superintendent, while another specialist emerges to accomplish strategic coordination at the local building level.¹³

In closing this section dealing with suggested changes in the principal's responsibilities, it would be fitting to look at the statement on the legal status for principals made by the Illinois Principals' Coordinating Council.

¹³

Donald A. Erickson, "Changes in the Principalship", National Elementary Principal, April, 1965, p. 20.

StatementPrincipal:

Duties: When a person is designated as principal of an attendance center, he shall have charge of the administration of the attendance center under the direction of the superintendent. The principal shall keep, or cause to be kept, the records and accounts as directed and required by the superintendent, and perform such duties as the superintendent may delegate to him.

The principal shall assume a leadership role of all personnel assigned to the attendance center in the planning, the operation and the evaluation of the educational program of the attendance center. The principal shall assume responsibility of implementing the approved system of data collection which will adequately reflect the results of the educational program as related to the attendance center.

The principal shall be responsible for submitting recommendations to the central office staff concerning the appointment, retention, promotion and assignment of all personnel assigned to the attendance center.

The principal shall participate in the planning of, and cooperate in the conducting of, in-service programs and meetings of teachers and consultants for the purpose of evaluating and improving the program of education.¹⁴

In this dynamic age we are living in today, the future is uncertain and ever-changing. As a result of this, the roles of all persons, including that of the school principal, are subject to many changing and conflicting conditions. What are

¹⁴Illinois Principals' Coordinating Council, 1968.

some of the forces that will affect the role of the principal and what type of leadership will be required of the principal in his emerging role?

Arthur J. Lewis, Professor of Education, Columbia University, says to understand the forces that will affect the role of the principal, a look at the emerging nature of society itself is needed. Society has many distinct features which will have a direct impact on the nature of the school and thus on the role of the elementary school principal. The technological revolution is one feature, followed by the information explosion. Radical changes like these demand more and better trained manpower. Much of the literature indicates that fifty per cent of the students now in the primary grades will start their careers in vocations that do not now exist. Future professionals will find it necessary to be engaged in constant education, and re-education. If they fail to respond, they may face rapid obsolescence. This includes elementary school principals.

Another feature of our society is the number of people in it that are being denied equal access to equal opportunities. The gap between the "haves" and "have nots" is becoming greater and greater. This is a gap between the ideal of access for all

and the reality of access denied. The gap is the force that will have a direct impact on the schools.

The shifting pattern of decision-making is another force shaping the role of the principal. Not too long ago, the decision-making power in a school system could be portrayed on an organizational chart. At the top of the chart was the board of education representing the community. Second was the superintendent and if he was democratic "he would" or "the chart might" provide some freedom for principals and teachers to make decisions.

It is becoming more evident to many that teachers and pupils are two vital inputs into the school. Teachers are aware that they can control a vital input into our schools and are using this control to secure a role in decision-making. They negotiate directly with school boards or, if necessary, a higher authority. They will negotiate whenever they have to in order to get results. Principals and superintendents are in the direct line of fire and will be the first to get hit with this new power.

Parents are realizing they can exercise control through the pupil. They are learning the language of protest. Community groups, parent groups, and non-parent groups are

organizing boycotts, initiating action with the superintendents and with the board of education. Parent groups will be initiating action with governmental bodies as well.¹⁵

Moody says educators today must keep abreast of movements in society which are apt to affect, directly or indirectly, the future of education. The educator must be ready to resist those currents which he feels are wrong and support those he feels are right.¹⁶

American public education is undergoing tremendous strains in a period of unprecedented transition and controversy. Principals have been the target of all types of groups advocating all types of changes in their schools.

English speaks of major events that have forced educators to consider change. They are (1) Citizen groups at the national level that have called for the creation of a private educational system to replace the public system. They say the public system has failed to provide the means of social mobility for minority groups. Our society's rapid changes have

¹⁵Arthur J. Lewis, "The Future of the Elementary School Principalship", National Elementary Principal, September, 1968, pp. 8-13.

¹⁶Harold Moody, "Flight of Principal", The Clearing House, May, 1968, pp. 543-45.

left the old educational organization behind. (2) Teacher training is becoming more sophisticated, as a result of demands by the public and by school administrators. This advanced training has provided the impetus for teachers to challenge the organizational rules which lock them out of the decision-making process. Teachers are challenging the administrative hierarchy in their strikes and resignations.¹⁷

Erickson focuses attention on five trends that may outline the role of the principal of the future. The first is increased specialization of school personnel. The days of the normal school are past, and the era of the master teacher is here. The pressure for expertise is descending through the grade levels as we understand more clearly the importance of the early years. The principal's task will be that of coordinating the work of many specialists who will function in this milieu.

Second, he considers the individual who becomes more highly qualified and therefore less tolerant of the authority of office and more sensitive to the authority of competence. When dealing with proficient personnel, the administrator who attempts to give direction in areas in which he is not perceived

¹⁷ English, Phi Delta Kappan, pp. 159-65.

as competent may expect to encounter resistance. Teachers tend to turn to colleagues who, they feel, exercise the authority of competence, for needed specialization and assistance.

Teaching and learning are demanding more autonomy for individuals and teams within schools. The teaching function will become that of creating situations conducive to self-directed inquiry, reinforcing the public curiosity, and helping the student discover what he needs in the on-going appropriation of knowledge. The "superteacher," the teacher of teachers, has been the principal in many schools in the past and is possibly the principal in a few schools today. If there is rationality among administrators, the obvious move would be more autonomy for the experts in the schools.

A fourth trend will be a matching of principals to schools. Various pedagogical approaches will be needed for children from various cultural backgrounds. Different kinds of school-community relations are necessary in different situations. All teachers will not have the same response to the same leadership. Standardized procedures for schools will have to be abandoned and more emphasis will have to be given to producing in each school the unique "mix" of persons,

facilities, materials, and activities that is most effective for that situation.

Finally, as greater specialization develops among schools and within staffs, and more services are made available through faculties and central offices, there will be greater need for explicit division of responsibility. Limitations of authority of office will be more clearly recognized in the organization of authority in situations where their subordinates are more highly qualified.

Tomorrow's principal will be a strategist who takes human and material components of a school and community and rationally and artfully joins them to build a functioning whole.¹⁸

The role of today's principal, according to Moody, is precarious. He must be a manager, supervisor, psychologist, financial wizard, master of law, public relations specialist, public-speaker, school and community leader, first-aid specialist; and additionally, he must be "a good guy" as well. He is expected to be understanding, fair, reasonable, flexible, patient, stable, and always available. He should inspire,

¹⁸ Donald E. Erickson, "Faces for Change in the Principalship", The Elementary School Journal, November, 1964, pp. 57-64.

ameliorate, mediate, organize, sponsor, attend, and react properly to pressures. He avoids controversial issues like civil rights, busing, unions, protests, the draft and Vietnam.¹⁹

Romine discusses significant influences on the role of the principal in terms of (1) those within the educational establishment, (2) those in the community, state and nation, and (3) those on the international scene.

Within the educational establishment, growing centralization has a tendency to stifle flexibility and foster standardization. This trend is caused by the inability and unwillingness at local and state levels to provide equal educational opportunity. Federal aid in categorical form has been a strong factor in stifling flexibility.

Innovation and specialization exert considerable influence on education and administration. Educators must find a way to harness these movements in order to receive their benefits.

A new breed of teachers and pupils is brighter and better educated, less tractable and more likely to speak out. Teachers today are not so conventional as they once were in

¹⁹ Moody, Clearing House, pp. 543-45.

their ethics, ideals, or motivation. Our profession is experiencing a power-struggle and a good deal of the militant behavior is a result of the failure of administrators and trustees and citizens to meet legitimate needs of teachers. There is constant pressure and it is growing because of the success it has experienced. Collective bargaining and professional negotiations will have a tendency to restrict the leadership of principals.

Collegiate competition for teachers has caused a trend toward hiring away from secondary schools their better prepared teachers, creating a problem with recruitment, induction, in-service education, and curricular improvement.

Bases of authority, decision-making and implementation, power-sharing, and other aspects of human relations and dynamics are undergoing change.

The size and complexity of our schools plus the total educational venture has much influence on the principal. These conditions tend to reduce individual identity and promote a breakdown of group membership.

Four of the crucial influences outside the educational establishment which affect the principal's role are population explosion, implosion, and mobility; social and moral conflict,

change and improvement; rising educational costs and taxation; and higher educational expectations.

Looking at the international scene we have world-wide social revolution and cold wars; the space race; and our ascending international role. The race for outer space has stepped up criticism of schools and this criticism continues to advocate more and improved mathematics and science instruction.²⁰

Stanavage lists tasks that will be representative of the principal's future role. They are:

1. Much of the principal's time will be spent on the improvement of instruction. He will help the individual teacher reach the individual child.
2. Principals will become directly involved with the instructional needs of individual students as they observe them daily in and out of the classroom.
3. The principal will be responsible for the development of the program. This will demand constant upgrading in his knowledge of current developments in education.
4. The principal will keep his staff alert and informed. He will stimulate and encourage their desire to attend conferences and do

²⁰

Stephen A. Romine, "Current Influences Changing the Principal's Role", The North Central Association Quarterly, XLII, Fall, 1967, pp. 187-91.

advanced study. His job will be to motivate people.

5. The imaginative and productive deployment of teachers will be one of the major considerations for the principal.
6. The principal will have to crash through the wall of isolation surrounding his school. He must establish a liaison with all the many groups outside the school which are involved in the education of our young people.
7. The principal will have to sustain the morale of the staff and make certain the search for improvement continues, no matter what thwarting rebuffs are experienced.

The above list could be expanded, but we should realize there is an end to the energies of the principal and to develop an interminable list would only be an attempt to deceive the public.

The principal must learn to say no; he must learn how to delegate; and he must learn to take himself at his own worth. His privilege of rank will vanish in the turmoil of teacher militancy. What he accomplishes will be a result of the leadership he exerts.²¹

Change and innovation are becoming standard procedures,

²¹ John A. Stanavage, "Educational Leader: An Authentic Role", National Association of Secondary School Principals, LI, November, 1967, pp. 3-17.

and for the elementary school principal, a responsibility exists to keep abreast of these changes and plan for their implementation. The world of the elementary school administrator will undergo many changes in the opinion of numerous educators.

Some of the observations are summarized in the following paragraphs.

Administrators must recognize the need for continuing education in light of the present knowledge explosion. The elementary school principal will need to have a better understanding of his community and people in it. Human relations skill will be essential for effective relations.

The principal will be considered the chief change agent in the school. He will be a "Jack of all trades," leaving little time for supervision. Much time will be spent with grievance committees and negotiation teams.

The principal will be responsible for setting the tone of the school and pulling together all outside agencies for the improvement of the educational program.

Technology and computers will revolutionize education even more than at present. The principal will be making

higher level decisions with more and better organized information.²²

The supervision-centered conception of the principalship has become inappropriate and outdated. A conception more appropriate to our needs must become prevalent in the near future or the building principal may be relegated to the role of managerial caretaker with little to say in the decision-making process. This does not mean that the principal should remove himself from responsibility for classroom instruction. It does mean that his role behavior should be sharply different from that which was traditionally expected of principals.²³

Principals must make a momentous difference in the quality of the individual teacher-learner encounter. Stanavage says the new school leader will promptly abdicate the position of middle management but makes no mention about the legality of this move. The principal's fundamental responsibility will be

²² Ruth Crossfield, "The Changing World of the Principal", National Elementary Principal, XLVII, No. 5, April, 1968, pp. 12-13.

²³ Harold J. McNally, "The American Principal Tomorrow", National Elementary Principal, XLVII, No. 6, May, 1968, p. 86.

to ensure that education in his school takes a forward step. The principal of tomorrow will not be middle management. Nor will he be an office administrator. His task will be to help the staff perceive and clarify educational goals and objectives, to chart new roads to excellence. The central objective of his educational leadership will be to meet face to face and idea to idea with every professional member of the staff as frequently as feasible.²⁴

American education has increasingly come under new command and is headed in a new direction. Technology, urbanization, population explosion, the space race, the Negro protest, and the need to maintain economic growth have all played a part in encouraging a new role to emerge in places of power.

According to Moody, principals today face situations undreamed of a decade ago. Teachers are better educated and more opinionated. Students are concerned more today about vital affairs, are more rebellious, and less prone to need counsel and advice. Personalization and communication are difficult to achieve with our expanding schools. Outside groups apply more

pressure than ever, disrupting the smoother more professional flow of the educational process.²⁵

Redefinition of the role of the principal is in order in view of the changing influences mentioned. Such action is likely to require several years, and the role will undergo much modification over the next decade.

²⁵ Harold Moody, "Plight of the Principal", The Clearing House, May, 1968, p. 544.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Chapter IV contains three major aspects of this dissertation: (1) the hypotheses of the study; (2) a rationale for each hypothesis; (3) the propositions used to test the hypotheses. The statements of proposition pertaining to the six hypotheses were scattered to minimize the possibility of influencing the responses. (See Appendix A.) The responses of the principals and reasons for their particular choices will be presented along with a critique and analysis of these data.

Two approaches were used in this study: (1) a research of current professional literature to ascertain the trend of expression from prominent educators concerning the role of the principal (See Appendix B); (2) a forty-five minute interview of principals in south suburban Cook County to determine if those principals agree on the resemblance of their own roles and that stated in professional literature.

The responses of the principals to the propositions were categorized using a modified Likert scale. Responses were asked

to be expressed according to personal feelings in one of the five following degrees: Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Undecided (U), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD). To score the scale, the alternative responses are weighted +2, +1, 0, -1, and -2, respectively, from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. If all principals Strongly Agree to a proposition, that proposition would receive +60 points. If all principals Strongly Disagree to a proposition, that proposition would receive -60 points. As the numbers increase positively, so does the principals' agreement with the proposition. As the numbers increase negatively, so does the principals' disagreement with the proposition.

The comments to the individual propositions are represented by numbers and lines. An example of how to interpret the data is given below.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(8) 26.6%	(19) 63.3%	(2) 6.6%	0	(1) 3.3%
(Total points received +33)				

1. SA, A, U, D, SD - See above.
2. The number in parentheses represents the number of principals making that particular selection.

3. The number next to the parenthesis is the number of principals selecting that particular response converted to a percentage.
4. The above graphical representation would read, eight principals or 26.6 per cent of the sample selected the alternative Strongly Agree. Nineteen or 63.3 per cent selected the alternative Agree. Two or 6.6 per cent selected Undecided. No one selected Disagree. One or 3.3 per cent selected Strongly Disagree.
5. The total weight of the proposition was calculated as follows:

Response	Number of Principals	Weight	Points
SA	8	+2	+16
A	19	+1	+19
U	2	0	0
D	0	-1	0
SD	1	-2	-2
Total			+33

Hypothesis I

Principals will find it necessary to organize in order to combat the power plays of others and shape their own destiny.

The first hypothesis deals with the question of whether or not the principals will find it necessary to organize to be effective, and not have their roles dictated by pressure groups. Propositions one, seven, fourteen, twenty-nine, thirty, thirty-one, thirty-three, and thirty-five pertain to this hypothesis.

Stephen A. Romine, Dean of the College of Education, University of Colorado, states:

In these explosive times all persons including the school principal are subject to many changes and conflicting conditions. Collective bargaining and professional negotiations tend to restrict the leadership of the principal. The job of the administrator is changing, particularly because of the growing dissension within the educational ranks. The administrator cannot wisely avoid the conflict nor seek to shape his own destiny alone. It may be necessary that he and other administrators organize to combat the power plays of others, if dignity, fairness, reason and professional integrity cannot otherwise be maintained.¹

What place do principals and other "middle management" personnel hold in today's schools? What can principals do when their rights are violated? To seek employment elsewhere is not the answer. Until five years ago, principals never considered affiliation with a union. Last September members of the

¹Romine, North Central Quarterly, pp. 187-91.

Philadelphia Principals Association held meetings with members of the Teamsters Union which caused emotional reaction from within the profession.

Ralph E. Clabaugh, a former Illinois school superintendent, states: "Principals may attempt to organize locally to defend themselves against teachers and to confront boards of education with some show of force."²

John Desmond, President of the Chicago Teachers Union, at the 1968 Education Conference of the Chicago Principals Club pointed to the principal's role of man in the middle and indicated they are besieged by upper echelon administration, community representatives, and teachers. He recommended principals alleviate their problems by becoming better organized among themselves. He also indicated that the teachers' union door to membership is closed to principals.³

Proposition 1

As individuals, principals will have little effect on influencing their future roles.

² Ralph E. Clabaugh, "A Superintendent Looks at Negotiations", Education Age, September-October, 1968, p. 12.

³ John Desmond, Chicago Principals Club Reporter, LVII, No. 4, Summer, 1968, p. 19.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(8) 26.6%	(22) 73.3%	0	0	0

(Total points received +38)

All thirty principals agreed with this proposition. The principals indicated in today's society any effort made by an individual to initiate change is likely to be unsuccessful. Today's trend for principals is to organize collectively for a stronger power base. Principals must present a united front to pressure superintendents.

The majority of the principals seem to favor a professional form of organization rather than unionization. Almost all the principals suggested making a greater effort to become active with existing state organizations and their locals.

Proposition 7

The power of the principals will diminish if they fail to organize.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(20) 66.6%	(5) 16.6%	(4) 13.3%	(1) 3.3%	0

(Total points received +44)

The most common statement given by the principals agreeing was, "Everyone else is doing it." They also remarked that organizing was very successful for teachers; henceforth, principals could make similar gains by doing the same. In the process of organizing, principals will have to be cautious not to form too many splinter groups and go off in several different directions. One principal suggested they should organize with district office administration. Principals that expressed agreement were thoroughly convinced that organizing for mutual support and show of force is essential.

One principal stated that no educational gain could be realized through principals organizing for power; but rather, principals should work for community and staff support.

Proposition 14

Principals should have the prerogative to organize a locally sponsored professional organization to represent their most immediate concerns.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(17) 56.6%	(12) 40%	(1) 3.3%	0	0
(Total points received +46)				

"As citizens we have the right to organize," state the

principals who agree. Many indicated they are presently beginning to organize with neighboring districts and forming principal's clubs. Principals felt they needed an outlet to express their grievances; others felt this might be a way to grow professionally and at the same time protect their interests. Many of the principals would like a stronger affiliation with state organizations. Principals also indicated that state organizations are not doing enough for principals, such as, improving the image of the principal, encouraging the principals to unite, and improving general working conditions.

Proposition 24

Principals are taking positive steps to increase the influence of their positions.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(9) 30%	(14) 46.6%	(2) 6.6%	(4) 13.3%	(1) 3.3%
(Total points received +26)				

Some of the ways principals are increasing their influence include the organization of clubs, receiving additional training, holding positions of office at the state level, and keeping current with the literature. Principals can also strengthen their position by gaining the confidence of

their staff and parents in the community. These comments were made by some of the principals who agreed with proposition twenty-four. A few principals indicated new state requirements are forcing an upgrading of the principal.

Two of the principals that disagreed felt principals are not doing much to increase their influence and, in many cases, they are afraid of their superintendents.

Proposition 29

Negotiations will have a great impact on the principal's role.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(11) 36.6%	(15) 50%	(2) 6.6%	(2) 6.6%	0
(Total points received +35)				

We find the majority of principals agreeing with this statement. The feeling was that present negotiations between teachers and boards should encourage principals to begin negotiating in their own behalf. Three principals stated that the impact could be so great, teachers might decide whom to appoint as principal. Principals are aware of the impacts already influencing their roles, and they realize that organizing

and defining their own role is imperative in order to prevent other groups from defining it for them.

Proposition 30

The Board of Education alone cannot negotiate in the best interest of principals.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(25) 83.3%	(5) 16.6%	0	0	0

(Total points received +55)

All principals agreed to this proposition because they feel boards of education are not totally aware of the principal's position. They are more likely to give in to the teachers rather than fight for the principals because of the difference in numbers.

The principals also suggested the board members do not know what prerogatives of the principal can be bargained away.

In general, principals say board members only have a superficial knowledge of the principal's job and on this basis the board member is incapable of being the best representative of the principal in the negotiating process.

Proposition 31

Principals should actively participate in the negotiation process to prevent having their powers bargained away.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(19) 63.3%	(10) 33.3%	(1) 3.3%	0	0
(Total points received +48)				

Principals agree they should partake in the negotiating process in some capacity even if it is just in an advisory manner. By participating, principals will have a better understanding when it comes to implementing the agreement. Principals will also be in a better position to try and influence any concessions board members would want to make that may weaken the position of the principal.

Proposition 33

The principal is being forced into a position of middle management.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(5) 16.6%	(21) 70%	(2) 6.6%	(2) 6.6%	0
(Total points received +29)				

Principals for the most part expressed agreement and further indicated they are not so sure of what position in management they hold. They argue teachers do not want principals on their side, and the superintendents are siding with board members. Another comment was that principals lack the authority; someone else dictates and principals carry out the orders.

Principals who disagreed say their roles are not managerial but are of educational leadership. Principals should concern themselves with organizing talent.

Proposition 35

Educational power is shifting from administration to teachers' groups.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(8) 26.6%	(20) 66.6%	0	(2) 6.6%	0
(Total points received +34)				

Principals agree this is happening because of teacher militancy. It appears the more militant teachers become, the more success they experience. This transfer of power is a result of teachers organizing. Because of their large

membership in the profession, teachers can persuade board members and superintendents to give in to their demands.

A few principals indicated this shift of power must be counteracted by principals organizing to present a show of strength.

Summary Table for Hypothesis I

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
Proposition 1 (Points +38)	(8) 26.6%	(22) 73.3%	0	0	0
Proposition 7 (Points +44)	(20) 66.6%	(5) 16.6%	(4) 13.3%	(1) 3.3%	0
Proposition 14 (Points +46)	(17) 56.6%	(12) 40%	(1) 3.3%	0	0
Proposition 24 (Points +26)	(9) 30%	(14) 46.6%	(2) 6.6%	(4) 13.3%	(1) 3.3%
Proposition 29 (Points +35)	(11) 36.6%	(15) 50%	(2) 6.6%	(2) 6.6%	0
Proposition 30 (Points +55)	(25) 83.3%	(5) 16.6%	0	0	0
Proposition 31 (Points +48)	(19) 63.3%	(10) 33.3%	(1) 3.3%	0	0
Proposition 33 (Points +29)	(5) 16.6%	(21) 70%	(2) 6.6%	(2) 6.6%	0
Proposition 35 (Points +34)	(8) 26.6%	(20) 66.6%	0	(2) 6.6%	0

Summary and Analysis

There seems to be agreement among prominent educators and principals on the idea that principals should unite into some kind of affiliation for the purpose of creating a power structure; there looms, however, a question over the exact purpose for this affiliation. Many educational authorities express concern about pressure groups forming to usurp the authority or prerogative of the principal.

Throughout the personal interviews principals expressed a strong desire for more participation in major decision-making, formulation of policy, and defining the principal's role. The statements made by principals reveal a strong indication that very shortly principals may organize to increase their influential powers in areas where they were formerly excluded.

One prominent educator hinted principals might organize with the Teamsters Union. This affiliation would be unlikely since the principals expressed a desire for a professional amalgamation as may be found in a principal's club or a National Education Association endorsed affiliate.

Principals are re-examining their roles and posing many questions about the lack of opportunities to participate with central office administration in major decision-making.

On two occasions principals remarked they dislike the practice of superintendents and school boards bypassing principals by engaging in secretive sessions to formulate policies. The suspicion of principals clearly indicates an unhealthy relationship between levels of administration which could cause drastic polarization of administrative teams and weaken considerably leadership possibilities.

It is likely principals will organize initially at the local district level, since one of the principals' major concerns seems to be a desire to stimulate superintendents and board members in showing more concern for principals' services.

The voice of the individual principal is not being heard. Apparently, decisions and actions by groups of principals will be the trend principals will follow as they strive for a more significant role in educational planning.

Hypothesis II

Principals today feel they no longer assist in developing policy, but boards of education, superintendents, teacher organizations and parents "call the plays."

This hypothesis deals with the diminishing role of the principal as an authority figure. Propositions eight,

thirteen, fifteen, and twenty-five pertain to this hypothesis.

George B. Redfern, Associate secretary of the American Association of School Administrators says:

The principalship will be markedly altered and eventually supplanted by some other form of administrative control in local schools. Some people predict that the time will come when committees of teachers will wield larger and larger power in decision-making in an increasing number of areas. This will alter the role of the principal, making him an implementor and coordinator of policies and procedures emanating from local committees rather than from central staff. The principal may be an active participant in committee decision-making but he will be one among peers.⁴

Arthur J. Lewis, Department Chairman, Columbia University, in his article, indicates there is a need for leadership in our schools but it does not necessarily assure the position of the principal. He goes on to say the principal is not the only person who can provide educational leadership. Several groups have moved into positions of power because they have been permitted to participate in the decision-making process. These groups are willing to assume the leadership.⁵

⁴ George B. Redfern, "Negotiations Change Principal-Teacher Relationships", The National Elementary Principal, XLVII, No. 5, April, 1968, p. 22.

⁵ Arthur J. Lewis, National Elementary Principal, p. 11.

In a related article, Redfern stresses the fact that the school administrator must continually ask himself these questions:

1. To whom do the public schools belong?
2. Whose voice will be heeded?
3. To whose influences will he yield?
4. How will conflicting demands be reconciled?

As more and more special interest groups press for schools to conform to their particular desires and concerns, and when these conflict with one another, the administrator finds himself in a difficult situation.⁶

Proposition 8

Superintendents include principals in the decision-making process to determine district policy.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(3) 10%	(14) 46.6%	0	(13) 43.3%	0
(Total points received +7)				

⁶ George B. Redfern, "Court Decisions: The School Administrators Dilemma", Educational Leadership, XXVI, No. 3, December, 1968, p. 234.

The response to this proposition was fairly evenly distributed between the principals who agreed and those who disagreed. The comments made to support this proposition suggest that all good superintendents include their principals in the formulation of policy. In a few instances principals thought the reason they were asked to help formulate policy was due to the fact that their districts were relatively small and all the administrators worked closely together. Several principals said they knew of other districts where principals did not have any say in developing policy.

The dissenters indicated that they rarely make decisions regarding district policy. Communication on this topic with the superintendent is nonexistent. Three principals indicated they would probably continue to be excluded from assisting in developing policy until principals unite with one another and become more insistent with their superintendents.

Proposition 13

Principals are only called to help develop policy when there is a crisis.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(1) 3.3%	(14) 46.6%	(3) 10%	(10) 33.3%	(2) 6.6%
(Total points received +2)				

Similar to the responses for proposition eight, we observe a split between agreement and disagreement. It is apparent that principals from small districts participate more in developing policy than principals in larger districts. Many of the principals who agreed were from large districts and many who disagreed were from small districts.

Two of the principals who agreed said they were "ax men" and were only called when the board or superintendent got into trouble. Many indicated the job of the principal is getting the policy from someone else and making sure it is carried out.

Those who were not in agreement thought being included in developing policy was a matter of fact and were always included when this took place. Once again, most of these principals were from small districts.

Proposition 15

Principals will be one of the most influential groups in the future educational scheme.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(2) 6.6%	(8) 26.6%	(15) 50%	(5) 16.6%	0

(Total points received +7)

Many principals expressed uncertainty regarding this

proposition. They indicate much will depend on how the principals react to pressure groups, how they challenge the decisions being made by the upper echelon of administration, and how well they become organized. Other principals expressed the opinion that if principals are not one of the most influential groups in the future, the position of "principal" may not exist.

The people in agreement said principals are on the scene and, being on the front line, they will be in a position to prevent a deterioration of their status.

The few who disagreed thought parent groups and teachers will dominate the scene because of their large numbers and because boards of education will yield to these numbers.

Proposition 25

Principals are in a position to work with all groups to establish district policies.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(11) 36.6%	(17) 56.6%	(1) 3.3%	(1) 3.3%	0
(Total points received +38)				

Although there is strong agreement to this proposition by a substantial majority of the principals, there was a major

reservation made by almost all persons responding. The principals indicated they rarely work with groups of parents or staff members for the purpose of influencing district policy. They felt that superintendents were remiss for not taking advantage of the unique position of the principals with these groups. Almost all policies are established at the district level by the superintendent and the board of education.

Summary Table for Hypothesis II

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
Proposition 8 (Points +7)	(3)10%	(14)46.6%	0	(13)43.3%	0
Proposition 13 (Points +2)	(1) 3.3%	(14)46.6%	(3)10%	(10)33.3%	(2)6.6%
Proposition 15 (Points +7)	(2) 6.6%	(9)26.6%	(15)50%	(5)16.6%	0
Proposition 25 (Points +38)	(11)36.6%	(17)56.6%	(1) 3.3%	(1) 3.3%	0

Summary and Analysis

The principals were somewhat evenly divided with respect to their feelings toward hypothesis II.

Evidence indicates that principals in smaller districts

participate more with their superintendents in developing programs, employing personnel, and in general decision-making than principals in larger districts. The responses from the principals in larger districts indicate they are more confined to their buildings and seldom work with central office administration on major plans concerning the entire district. The larger school districts employ assistant superintendents, curriculum directors, and business managers specifically to solve district level problems. This employment practice reduces the need for principals working with the superintendent on district level decisions.

Responses from principals in smaller districts indicate they consider themselves part of an administrative team sharing in the decision-making process.

The responses from principals in larger districts would tend to indicate they receive direction from central office administrators and apply this direction at the local building level.

The responses indicate a desire on the part of principals to expound actively their own roles to affect educational administration at the district level and to make significant contributions to the entire educational spectrum.

If principals continually experience the fact that only groups who exert pressure will be permitted to influence policy, the relationship within the administrative team will weaken. Principals need to have opinions and ideas accepted and considered important by their superintendents.

Since individual schools offer direct services to the community, the principal should acquire a broad power base from which to operate. Principals must demonstrate that they have the necessary leadership authority if they are to make significant educational contributions.

Hypothesis III

Principals today feel they are in a "no-man's land" in regard to their roles.

The third hypothesis suggests that the principals are in a temporary state of limbo. Some say this is a result of all the forces being exerted on the board of education and superintendent. Propositions two, four, ten, seventeen, and twenty-one pertain to this hypothesis.

Assistant Superintendent Benjamin Epstein, Newark, New Jersey Public Schools, reported the following:

The principal's frequent unwillingness to see himself as part of the school system executive structure has serious ramifications. His close daily contact with

teachers deludes him into thinking he plays a role which really does not exist. The uncertainty of the principal about himself has caused superintendents and school boards to be equally unsure about principals. The result has been not only that principals are unheard and bypassed at the bargaining table but that often they are victims of board-teacher "compromises." It can be easy for a board to grant an item which does not cost money but greatly erodes the prerogatives of principals.⁷

The role of today's principal is precarious. He appears to be searching for identity. Unions and some teacher associations will not have him because they claim he is too close to the "other side." Governing boards appoint superintendents for close relationships on school matters, and thus the poor principal does not fit there either.⁸

Dr. James J. Harmon, Assistant Superintendent, points out the fact that teachers often negotiate directly with boards of education, with the principal being placed to the outside. If this movement is not worked with carefully, the role of the principal could be reduced to one of "nothingness," with little authority.⁹

⁷ Benjamin Epstein, Education U.S.A. Newsletter, March 10, 1969, p. 153.

⁸ Moody, Clearing House, p. 543.

⁹ James J. Harmon, "The Principal's Role in a Changing Power Structure", School and Community, November, 1968, p. 45.

Proposition 2

Principals feel inadequate when carrying out their duties and responsibilities because the definition of their role is not clear.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(5) 16.6%	(20) 66.6%	(3) 10%	(2) 6.6%	0
(Total points received +28)				

Most principals indicated a need for more clarification of their roles. Several commented that many times they felt unsure whether or not they could make certain decisions.

Principals feel they are committed to enforce and influence policy but rarely play an active part in its formation.

Those who disagreed thought their roles were clearly defined and were satisfied. Almost all the principals rejected the word "inadequate" used in the proposition. Although the majority concurred with the statement, they made it clear they did not feel inadequate when it comes to performing on the job. The principals are unsure of their limits and a better definition of their roles would clarify the situation.

Proposition 4

Principals would feel more secure in their roles if superintendents and school boards were more sure of the status of the principal.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(9) 30%	(19) 63.3%	(1) 3.3%	(1) 3.3%	0
(Total points received +36)				

The principals who expressed agreement with this proposition indicated boards of education and central office administration appear to be uncertain of the principal's position. Teacher militancy and unrest seem to be the causes for this uncertainty. Some principals suggested we have to "play it by ear." One principal stated, "We never know where we stand." Two principals commented they are feeling their way because this is what district level administrators are doing.

Boards of education received a good deal of criticism with this proposition. Many of the principals stated boards do not have any idea of the responsibility and dimension of the principal's job. Principals expressed a strong desire to have their roles more clearly defined so they will have a better understanding of their limits of authority.

Principals who were undecided felt they did not reach a

point of uncertainty at present with regard to their roles, but the possibility exists if present trends continue.

Principals who disagreed indicated their roles were clearly defined and anyone who is uncertain about their role is not following district office policy and procedure.

Proposition 10

In order to clarify their position, principals must decide whether they are on the side of management or on the side of teachers.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(25) 83.3%	0	(3) 10%	(2) 6.6%	0

(Total points received +48)

The majority of the sample strongly agreed and were very emphatic about siding with management. They also expressed strong feelings about central office viewing the principal as part of the management team. There appeared to be some doubt as to whether or not principals were accepted by district office as part of the management team. A general feeling was principals cannot wear two hats and must make a choice and side with management. They also felt they are an arm of the superintendent which made it imperative to be considered management.

The undecided viewed the principal as a "go between." They felt the principal should not side with anyone but remain a separate group.

Principals who disagreed did not want to take sides but would rather see everyone working together as a team.

Proposition 17

Principals know what role they should assume; it is the district level administration that is unsure.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(4) 13.3%	(20) 66.6%	(4) 13.3%	(1) 3.3%	(1) 3.3%

(Total points received +25)

Principals that agreed indicated district level administrators get out of touch with what goes on at the building level. Others indicated the reason for uncertainty on the part of central office is due to the fact that central office personnel are preoccupied with their own district level problems. Many principals indicated there is a need for district level administration to develop a more clear cut definition of the principal's role.

The principals that did not agree stated all persons in education today are uncertain of their roles. As we solve some

of our current educational problems, the problem of the undefined principal's role will be solved.

Proposition 21

Board of Education settlements with teachers will determine the future role of the principal.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(4) 13.3%	(22) 73.3%	(2) 6.6%	(2) 6.6%	0
(Total points received +28)				

"The board of education could sell us down the river." This comment was made by a few of the principals that expressed agreement with the above statement. Most principals agreed they should be included or at least consulted on the issue of professional negotiations. The board could make concessions that may seriously handicap the principal in the operation of his building.

The undecided principals said if the board does a good job of negotiating, the future role of the principal will not be affected.

The principals who disagreed stated boards today are too well informed with regard to the pitfalls of negotiating

and will not make any concessions that will affect the principal's role to any great degree.

Summary Table for Hypothesis III

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
Proposition 2 (Points +28)	(5) 16.6%	(20) 66.6%	(3) 10%	(2) 6.6%	0
Proposition 4 (Points +36)	(9) 30%	(19) 63.3%	(1) 3.3%	(1) 3.3%	0
Proposition 10 (Points +48)	(25) 83.3%	0	(3) 10%	(2) 6.6%	0
Proposition 17 (Points +25)	(4) 13.3%	(20) 66.6%	(4) 13.3%	(1) 3.3%	(1) 3.3%
Proposition 21 (Points +28)	(4) 13.3%	(22) 73.3%	(2) 6.6%	(2) 6.6%	0

Summary and Analysis

The majority of the principals were in agreement with all the propositions relating to the third hypothesis.

Two premises are evident in the reactions to hypothesis III: (1) There is a need for a better definition of the principal's role. (2) More district level responsibility is needed in that role. It is imperative that superintendents and school boards recognize the implications in these premises and

make major efforts to restore authority to the role and involve principals in more educational planning.

There is a disparity as to how the principals moved into a position of uncertainty with regard to their roles. The literature suggests it is because the principal fails to see himself as part of the executive team. Principals' responses indicate it is lack of acceptance on the part of the superintendent to the executive team. This remark that principals are not accepted is consistent with the statements principals made regarding their lack of participation with their superintendents in major planning. When superintendents become cognizant of the shortcomings of excluding principals from major executive decision-making, they can begin to include principals within the major administrative framework needed for optimal problem solving.

Hypothesis IV

Principals will lose effectiveness unless they become partners with teachers in the shaping of school policies.

This hypothesis implies principals should work for new organizational relationships with teachers in the decision-making process. The principal may often share the

responsibility for making decisions with other members of the staff responsible for fulfilling the obligation of that decision. Propositions three, nine, sixteen, twenty, twenty-six, thirty-two, and thirty-six pertain to this hypothesis.

Thomas Wood, Executive Secretary, California Elementary School Administrators Association, says, "The trend toward teachers assuming additional responsibility is not going to be altered."¹⁰ In order for the education profession to be a positive cultural force in our society, principals should unite with teachers and help make "militancy" a responsible accrual of strength.

Teachers have realized that as long as the old system of paternalism exists, their own professional competence, training, continued education, and love of teaching will avail them very little, for the decisions that can bring about change will be left to others. The right to participate in decision-making demands responsible professional conduct.¹¹

Dr. George Redfern suggests the principal should make

¹⁰ Thomas C. Wood, "The Changing Role of the Teacher--How Does It affect the Role of the Principal", The National Elementary Principal, XLVII, No. 5, April, 1968, p. 35.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 35.

conscious and consistent efforts to strengthen staff relations. The efforts of the principal and staff members in achieving better performance should be complementary and mutually supportive. Only by joint effort can the best results be obtained.¹²

In such an atmosphere, according to English, the role of the principal changes to that of a skilled manager. The role can only be successfully realized when there is mutual professional respect between the participants, not the superior-subordinate relationship. Excellent classroom teachers may influence the decision-making process at many levels within the organization without having to become administrators. This will require an overhauling and remodeling of the educational hierarchy.¹³

Although the principal may still bear legal accountability for the school, his authority will be diffused throughout the teaching staff.

¹² George Redfern, Improving Principal-Faculty Relationships, Successful School Management Series (Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966), p. 41.

¹³ English, Phi Delta Kappan, pp. 160-61.

Proposition 3

Principals will be more effective if they include the staff in formulating policy.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(12 40%	(14) 46.6%	(1) 3.3%	(2) 6.6%	(1) 3.3%
(Total points received +34)				

Most of the principals indicated teachers should assist in developing policy, especially at the building level. Teachers would be more willing to carry out the policies if they are included in their formulation. If present trends continue, teachers will probably have more of an opportunity to assist formulating policy than principals. One of the more frequent demands made by teachers in the negotiation process is more say in the operation of the school system. Unlike principal's demands, teacher's demands are being met. A few principals suggested they would not include staff in the formulation of administrative policy. One principal indicated that if we could not include the staff, we should pretend we do.

The principals who disagreed said staff should not be included because their scope is too narrow. They also felt that including the staff in the formulation of policy would not make

the principal more effective, but his effectiveness could be improved by being more of an educational leader.

Proposition 9

Teachers and principals should make a concerted effort to join ranks to strengthen the position of the principal.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(1) 3.3%	(9) 30%	0	(14) 46.6%	(6) 20%
(Total points received -15)				

Principals who agreed thought this would be a good idea and would prevent principals and teachers from existing in two separate camps.

Most of the principals disagreed and indicated principals should not lean on teachers for strength. They also remarked principals, superintendents, and school board members should join ranks with one another to strengthen the position of the principal.

Proposition 16

Teachers do not have a broad enough view of the educational program to partake in developing policy.

SA	A	U	D	SD
0	(2) 6.6%	(1) 3.3%	(18) 60%	(9) 30%
(Total points received -34)				

The majority of principals disagreed with this proposition. The general feeling is that teachers are quite capable and, in some cases, may have a broader view than the principal. The fact that principals are not able to participate as much as they would like in developing policy may be a reason for their strong feelings for teacher involvement. Principals feel teachers have the perception and ability and as professionals should be utilized.

One of the principals who agreed said teachers are too subject matter oriented. Another principal indicated in the future we will be forced to use teachers in developing policy as a result of professional negotiations.

Proposition 20

Many problems we have today with teachers is a result of giving them too much say in running the educational program.

SA	A	U	D	SD
0	(1) 3.3%	0	(25) 83.3%	(4) 13.3%
(Total points received -32)				

There is almost one hundred per cent disagreement with this proposition. Principals seem convinced that teachers have been ignored too long and have not had much say in the educational program. Possibly the problems we are having today with teachers could have been avoided if they had been given more opportunity to participate.

Only one principal agreed with the proposition and the impression given was teachers should be handled with a firm hand.

Proposition 26

Principals will always make the major decisions on implementing policy and operating the building.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(5) 16.6%	(9) 30%	(5) 16.6%	(7) 23.3%	(4) 13.3%

(Total points received +4)

The principals who expressed agreement felt they will always have the final say because they are responsible for the total operation of the building. They indicated they would seek advice but would always make the final decisions.

The undecided said it will depend on how much board

members and superintendents concede to teachers, and how well principals strengthen their own positions.

Principals who disagreed said the superintendent does, and always will, make the major decisions on implementing policy in a building. The number of principals who agreed to this proposition is surprising. The general attitude to prior related propositions was that principals really have no significant authority and are led to believe they made important decisions by being permitted to make unimportant token decisions.

Proposition 32

Principals could lose control of their staff if they assume a partnership relationship with teachers.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(5) 16.6%	(12) 40%	(4) 13.3%	(9) 30%	0
(Total points received +13)				

There are mixed emotions about proposition thirty-two. The principals that agree say there is a danger in getting close to staff members. If principals become too friendly, they will find it hard to criticize staff members when criticism is

necessary. The principals suggest a professional working relationship.

The principals who did not agree indicated they would not lose control of the staff should they assume a partnership relationship with teachers; however, they did suggest the partnership should be on a professional basis and deal with program improvement. One principal said work with the staff, but do not socialize with them.

Proposition 36

If present trends continue, principals will be little more than figureheads in the future.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(1) 3.3%	(8) 26.6%	(12) 40%	(6) 20%	(3) 10%
(Total points received -2)				

The undecided alternative received the largest number of responses. A considerable number of principals indicated much will depend on how well they organize, grow professionally, and solve problems. If principals do these things well, they could become real leaders and not figureheads. Principals must gain the support of the teachers and recognize talent in the staff.

The principals in agreement commented we are getting

more responsibility and less authority. Principals will have to stand up and be counted.

Those in disagreement feel principals will always be key persons in the educational process. They will become figureheads only to the extent that they allow this to happen.

Summary Table for Hypothesis IV

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
Proposition 3 (Points +34)	(12)40%	(14)46.6%	(1) 3.3%	(2) 6.6%	(1) 3.3%
Proposition 9 (Points -15)	(1) 3.3%	(9)30%	0	(14)46.6%	(6)20%
Proposition 16 (Points -34)	0	(2) 6.6%	(1) 3.3%	(18)60%	(9)30%
Proposition 20 (Points -32)	0	(1) 3.3%	0	(25)83.3%	(4)13.3%
Proposition 26 (Points +4)	(5)16.6%	(9)30%	(5)16.6%	(7)23.3%	(4)13.3%
Proposition 32 (Points +13)	(5)16.6%	(12)40%	(4)13.3%	(9)30%	0
Proposition 36 (Points -2)	(1) 3.3%	(8)26.6%	(12)40%	(6)20%	(3)10%

Summary and Analysis

Principals and prominent educators are in agreement that teachers should be utilized more in the total operation.

Principals indicate they would like a closer working relationship with teachers but fail to recognize how this relationship can come about. Principals seem to guard carefully against their relationships with teachers becoming anything less than business-like and professional. Perhaps a disparity in the perception of what constitutes a professional relationship exists and inhibits progress with professional camaraderie between teacher and principals. The same misperception of interpersonnel relationships could exist between principals and superintendents impairing their collegial exchange and professional trust.

Principals seem to have the needed empathy to establish tenable relationships with teachers. Perhaps this empathy emanates from the plight of principal-superintendent relationships.

Principals need to sense the authority commensurate with their responsibility so they can be comfortable with their decisions without having to check with the superintendent. Principals must have full control of their responsibilities if they are to guide the destiny of their decisions.

Hypothesis V

Principals will be likely to avoid exercising authority in advising and evaluating teachers because teachers are becoming more expert in their fields.

The fifth hypothesis suggests that administrators may avoid the exercise of authority in any matters in which their subordinates are more highly qualified than they. Propositions five, eleven, eighteen, twenty-two, and twenty-seven pertain to this hypothesis.

Because of the explosion of knowledge in many subject fields and a growing awareness of the many kinds of competence that are needed to make education effective, an increasing number of highly specialized personnel are being employed for our schools.¹³

The previous statement was made by Donald A. Erickson, Professor, University of Chicago. He continues to say the days of the normal school are past, and the era of the Master of Arts in Teaching is here. We are adding reading specialists, physical therapists and psychologists to our staffs. The pressure for expertise is descending through the grade levels as educators understand more clearly the importance of the early years. Much more attention will be paid to the effects of the pupils' total

¹³ Donald A. Erickson, "Forces for Change in the Principalship", The Elementary School Journal, November, 1964, p. 58.

milieu and to efforts to modify that milieu by manipulating components that can be controlled to compensate for deficiencies. This will call for specialists as yet unknown in schools. All in all, it seems rather certain that it will be increasingly difficult, if not impossible, for the principal to know half as much as his staff members know about their fields of proficiency, so that he will be ill-qualified in most respects to advise or evaluate them.¹⁴

Romine says a new breed of teachers is entering the profession. Today's teachers are brighter and better educated, less tractable and more likely to speak out. They are not so conventional as teachers once were in their ethics, their ideals, or their motivation.¹⁵

Proposition 5

Teachers are being more adequately trained to assume complete responsibility for their total classroom performance.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(2) 6.6%	(18) 60%	(4) 13.3%	(5) 16.6%	(1) 3.3%
(Total points received +15)				

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Romine, North Central Quarterly, pp. 187-91.

The majority of principals that agreed with proposition five stated teachers are better qualified and more responsible and should be given freedom commensurate with their improved status. These same principals were somewhat hesitant about giving teachers total responsibility and indicated the principal should be consulted concerning major decisions.

Principals who disagreed said teachers are geared too much to subject matter and may have a poor understanding of the total responsibility associated with classroom teaching. Two such responsibilities might be complete control of all problems that arise between teacher and parent, and complete control of who is to be retained or promoted. Teachers should only have complete responsibility of the subject matter taught.

Proposition 11

The knowledge gap between principals and teachers will become so great that the principal will be ill-qualified to evaluate his staff.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(1) 3.3%	(2) 6.6%	0	(23) 76.6%	(4) 13.3%
(Total points received -27)				

Strong disagreement was expressed by the principals with

this proposition. The majority of principals indicated they may well evaluate teachers who have more academic preparation in their teaching areas than the principal since other aspects of teaching would be observed by the principals, such as good teaching techniques, rapport with students, general climate of the classroom.

The principals that agreed said principals could become ill-qualified if they fail to keep up with new trends and ideas.

Proposition 18

Principals should not evaluate staff members who have better formal preparation in their academic fields.

SA	A	U	D	SD
0	(1) 3.3%	0	(26) 86.6%	(3) 10%
(Total points received -31)				

Similar to proposition eleven, there is strong disagreement for proposition eighteen. Again principals say they will evaluate methods of teaching and effects on students. Several principals indicated they would not have to be experts in every field to determine if a teacher is doing a good job.

The two principals who agreed indicated teachers will demand more objectivity in the evaluation process, possibly

teachers evaluating teachers similar to the medical profession where doctors evaluate doctors. Another suggestion was have a private agency do the evaluating. With more than one person evaluating there would be less chance of personal prejudice entering into the evaluation process.

Proposition 22

Principals will utilize other personnel to evaluate staff.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(2) 6.6%	(22) 73.3%	(1) 3.3%	(5) 16.6%	0

(Total points received +21)

Principals expressed a desire to utilize other personnel to assist in the evaluation process. Others indicated they do not have enough time to do an adequate job and need additional personnel. Many of the principals view the job of evaluating becoming more of a group process.

Principals who disagreed said this would weaken the role of the principal with the staff. Another principal commented that school districts will not be able to afford the additional personnel to evaluate staff.

Proposition 27

Principals do not have enough time to adequately evaluate the staff.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(2) 6.6%	(21) 70%	0	(6) 20%	(1) 3.3%
(Total points received +17)				

The principals that agreed indicated they get so much paper work and trivia that they do not have enough time to do an adequate job of evaluating. They spend a considerable amount of time with discipline and parental complaints. All these principals feel evaluation is very important and would like their situation to improve so they could devote more time to the evaluation process.

Principals who disagreed stated they have the time, more time than anyone. The job of evaluating is what principals were trained for, and evaluating staff is one of the main reasons principals are hired. Principals must make time in order to fulfill this obligation.

Summary Table for Hypothesis V

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
Proposition 5 (Points +15)	(2) 6.6%	(18) 60%	(4) 13.3%	(5) 16.6%	(1) 3.3%
Proposition 11 (Points -27)	(1) 3.3%	(2) 6.6%	0	(23) 76.6%	(4) 13.3%
Proposition 18 (Points -31)	0	(1) 3.3%	0	(26) 86.6%	(3) 10%
Proposition 22 (Points +21)	(2) 6.6%	(22) 73.3%	(1) 3.3%	(5) 16.6%	0
Proposition 27 (Points +17)	(2) 6.6%	(21) 70%	0	(6) 20%	(1) 3.3%

Summary and Analysis

Principals are aware of the increased specialization that is needed in our schools. The responses from the principals indicate they would welcome highly qualified specialists to assist in solving the more complex problems confronting our students and teachers. It is evident principals are admitting they can no longer attempt to be experts in all areas. Principals appear to view their roles as one of a strategist, utilizing staff to the optimum.

Principals do not agree with hypothesis V. The remarks

made by the principals would indicate they are very capable of evaluating staff, regardless of the qualifications of the staff members. The responses suggest that the principles of learning remain the same for all disciplines and as long as the principals have expertise in how one learns they can provide the services of educational administration which includes evaluation of instruction.

The elementary principal should be knowledgeable of the special competencies which specialists can give and be skilled in utilizing these competencies in realizing the educational goals of his school.

Hypothesis VI

Principals will have to establish professional competence in order to assume the role of educational leader.

In the future, leaders will rise or fall because of the quality of their thought processes rather than because of the prestige and authority of their offices says Robert L. Sinclair, Assistant Professor, University of Massachusetts.¹⁵ Propositions six twelve, nineteen, twenty-three, twenty-eight, thirty-four pertain to this hypothesis.

¹⁵ Robert L. Sinclair, "Leadership Concerns", The National Elementary Principal, XLVIII, No. 1, September, 1968, p. 20.

"A new idea of leadership has emerged," says David Lewis, administrator, New York City. The principal cannot be expected to be the fount of all wisdom. He is expected to use the best thinking available in his position. He must be firm as well as flexible. The principal is expected to consider people individually, but also is expected to make decisions in the best interests of all. He is to be respected, not feared. The democratic process has cut the "boss" down to size.

The principal, stripped of much of his power, is still required to be a leader. His authority is no longer derived automatically from his position; he must create it with his own innate resources, his personality, and the courage of his convictions.¹⁶

William W. Wayson, Assistant Professor, Syracuse University, indicates the competence of the changed principal will be measured in the interpersonal skills with which he works with his staff.¹⁷ Relations with the staff will be on a

¹⁶David Lewis, Elementary School Journal, p. 329.

¹⁷William W. Wayson, "The Elementary Principalship--Will It Be Part of the New Administration?", The National Elementary Principal, XLIV, No. 5, April, 1965, p. 15.

collegial basis and highly interrelated by the principal's coordination.

Smith elaborates on the leadership role of the principal by saying:

Principals will have to read, go to conferences, study, and generally stay abreast of what is new in the world and in the field of Education. Then the teachers, particularly the bright eager newcomers, will not look elsewhere for leadership. The principal can become a respected leader, a sought-after consultant, a highly regarded authority.¹⁸

Elementary principals are finding it necessary to create and sustain improved levels of professional performance. If they do not, they may well be swept aside in the maelstrom of contemporary events, states Luvern L. Cunningham, Director, Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago.¹⁹

Proposition 6

Principals should not pretend to be instructional experts, but should be concerned with getting experts and what to do with them.

¹⁸ Smith, Principals Club Reporter, p. 14.

¹⁹ Luvern L. Cunningham, "Continuing Professional Education for Elementary Principals", The National Elementary Principal, XLIV, No. 5, April, 1965, pp. 60-61.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(6) 20%	(23) 76.6%	0	(1) 3.3%	0
(Total points received +34)				

Almost all the principals agreed with proposition six. Principals indicated it is important to be confident on the job and know when to get assistance. They commented they cannot be a "Jack of All Trades." The principal should be more of a generalist or resource person rather than trying to be an expert. Schools should utilize experts to keep up with the rapid pace of our changing times.

Proposition 12

Principals will assume the leadership role based on the authority of office.

SA	A	U	D	SD
0	(4) 13.3%	0	(20) 66.6%	(6) 20%
(Total points received -28)				

Most principals disagreed and commented that to be a true educational leader, one will need to be competent in his position. A principal will need to use good common sense, be able to understand people, and work with and through teachers.

The leadership role of the principal will depend on how he performs as a professional educator.

The few principals who agreed thought the power associated with the principal's position would enable them to assume the necessary leadership. They also indicated that if the superintendent defines the principal as the leader in the policies of the district, it would help the principal assume his leadership role.

Proposition 19

The principal's leadership role will be directly related to his ability to perform in his building.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(7) 23.3%	(20) 66.6%	(2) 6.6%	(1) 3.3%	0
(Total points received +33)				

Most of the principals agree they will need to prove themselves by innovating, presenting new ideas, and just being worthy of leading other professionals. Teachers expect principals to be able to perform well, otherwise teachers will look elsewhere for leadership.

The one principal who disagreed said principals will be the leaders in their building no matter how well they

perform. The principal making this statement related it to the authority of office principal.

Proposition 23

Teachers no longer fear authority but respect ability.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(6) 20%	(22) 73.3%	0	(2) 6.6%	0

(Total points received +32)

Principals agree teachers will no longer function on blind obedience. Principals will find it necessary to give teachers good reasons for why they should or should not perform a certain way. Teachers are more capable and professional than they once were and expect their leaders to be the same. One principal indicated the reason teachers no longer fear authority is because they are organized and can fight back through their unions.

The principals who disagree feel teachers have become militant because they fear authority.

Proposition 28

Principals are making an effort to improve their image.

SA	A	U	D	SD
(2) 6.6%	(25) 83.3%	(1) 3.3%	(2) 6.6%	0

(Total points received +27)

Principals who agreed said they thought their colleagues were taking steps to improve their image by keeping up with the current trends, attending professional meetings, taking additional course work, and making sound educational improvements in their buildings.

One principal who disagreed said principals are just doing a lot of talking but nothing is really changing.

Proposition 34

The principal's leadership role is determined by the staff and how willing they are to let him lead.

SA	A	U	D	SD
0	(2) 6.6%	(3) 10%	(21) 70%	(4) 13.3%

(Total points received -27)

Twenty-five principals disagreed with this proposition

and indicate the leadership ability of a principal will be determined by his natural ability to lead. They say if a principal really has leadership qualities, the staff will not even be aware they are being led.

Some of the principals who were undecided said they could probably force their leadership on teachers if it were necessary.

Summary Table for Hypothesis VI

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
Proposition 6 (Points +34)	(6) 20%	(23) 76.6%	0	(1) 3.3%	0
Proposition 12 (Points -28)	0	(4) 13.3%	0	(20) 66.6%	(6) 20%
Proposition 19 (Points +33)	(7) 23.3%	(20) 66.6%	(2) 6.6%	(1) 3.3%	0
Proposition 23 (Points +32)	(6) 20%	(22) 73.3%	0	(2) 6.6%	0
Proposition 28 (Points +27)	(2) 6.6%	(25) 83.3%	(1) 3.3%	(2) 6.6%	0
Proposition 34 (Points -27)	0	(2) 6.6%	(3) 10%	(21) 70%	(4) 13.3%

Summary and Analysis

Principals and the prominent educators show strong agreement with regard to the leadership role of the principal and how this leadership will be acquired.

Principals realize teachers will no longer follow someone who is just a titular head, but are seeking strong leadership from someone who is worthy of their following.

It is evident from the responses given by the principals interviewed that the main responsibility of the principal is to utilize the talent available for the educational program. His utilization of the existing talent can serve as a measure of his competence. As more is understood about learning and individualization of instruction, the need for additional talent increases. The leadership role of the principal involves all aspects of employing the talent needed to solve problems and acquiring additional talent as needed. These ideas suggest that the leadership role of the principal must employ aspects of psychology, management, and human relations to be most effective. The conclusions drawn from hypothesis six reveal the role of the principal is anything but a stagnant one with strong needs for consistent experimentation, analysis, and revision.

Hypothesis I

Principals will find it necessary to organize in order to combat the power plays of others and shape their own destiny.

In the light of the accumulated data, this hypothesis can be accepted. It assumes that principals must form their own group to protect their interests. Principals feel the individual's voice in today's society is unnoticed. Two of the most frequent reasons given by principals for organizing were: (1) Everyone else is doing it and experiencing success in achieving their goals, and (2) In order to be noticed and have some say in developing district policy, principals will need to present a united front.

Principals indicated they will try to become more active with state level organizations and will also try to exert pressure on these organizations to do more for principals than they have done in the past. One of the most interesting organizations in its infant stage is the Coordinating Council of Principals, meeting at the state level. This organization is attempting to bring together principals of the elementary, junior high, and senior high levels for the purpose of having a single organization representing all principals.

It has been repeatedly pointed out by principals that they are aware their job is changing and they feel one way to make sure they have some influence on these changes would be through organizing. The principals in this study do not wish to affiliate with any form of a union.

There was considerable concern on the part of principals with regard to concessions school boards make to teachers and the effect this will have on the principal's authority.

Hypothesis II

Principals today feel they no longer assist in developing policy, but boards of education, superintendents, teacher organizations "call the plays."

The implication here is the principal's role is being reduced to one of "nothingness," with little authority. Principals no longer have as strong a participative voice as they once had.

The response to this hypothesis was fairly evenly divided between the principals who agreed and the principals who disagreed. The reason for the dichotomy appears to be a result of smaller districts using principals more in the formulation of policy than the larger districts. In the smaller districts, the principals assume additional

responsibilities such as, developing curriculum, recruiting personnel, and purchasing supplies. In larger districts, these duties are carried out by curriculum directors, assistant superintendents, and business managers.

Fifty per cent of the principals interviewed indicated they were undecided about the influence the principal will have in the future. They were, however, certain that the principals will have to initiate some action to counteract the various groups that threaten their authority.

Hypothesis III

Principals today feel they are in a "no-man's land" in regard to their roles.

The third hypothesis involves the status of the principal in the administrative hierarchy, and on the basis of the data, it is being accepted. Almost unanimously the principals want better clarification of their roles.

Principals find themselves hesitant at times making decisions because they are unsure of their roles and the amount of authority associated with their position. Principals want superintendents and board members to take a stand and define the limits of the principal's role.

Principals want to be part of the administrative team

and considered management. Principals, however, frequently get the impression they are excluded from management by the superintendent.

The board of education does not have the confidence of the majority of the principals interviewed. Principals feel board members do not really understand the principal's job and all its ramifications. This apparent lack of understanding on the part of the board also causes the principals to believe board members cannot function adequately for the best interest of principals in the negotiation process.

Hypothesis IV

Principals will lose effectiveness unless they become partners with teachers in the shaping of school policies.

This hypothesis deals with organizational relationships with teachers in the decision-making process. The results do not support this hypothesis.

Principals expressed a desire to work with staff in developing policy and further indicated that the staff would be more enthusiastic about implementing this policy if they were included in its formulation.

Principals insist their strength in their position should not be derived from teachers but from their ability and

knowledge to do the job. Principals have a high regard for teachers and their ability, and feel superintendents have neglected to take advantage of this resource.

Although principals respect the ability of teachers, and do not hesitate to agree that they should be included more in all aspects of the educational program, they do indicate the principal should remain known as the person who makes the final decision in the building.

Principals are aware of the power teachers can generate today. The principals view their roles as providing direction for this power and preventing the creation of a monster that could destroy a principal or any other administrative officer.

Principals will listen, take suggestions, permit teachers to participate, but with their interpersonal skills will remain on top of the building's organizational chart.

Hypothesis V

Principals will be likely to avoid exercising authority in advising and evaluating teachers because teachers are becoming more expert in their fields.

The data tends to disprove this hypothesis. Some authorities question the competency of the elementary principal to "supervise," since he "cannot know all" about any subject or

teaching method. Principals disagreed with these authorities and stated they may not have as much subject matter preparation as the teacher they are observing, but they would always be capable of determining whether or not the teacher was communicating with the students. Principals said they would observe the rapport, interaction, and if need be, they could call in specialists to observe the content being taught.

Principals feel evaluating staff is one of the most important facets of their job and do not wish to delegate this in total to specialists. They will, however, use the specialists when there is a need.

Principals view the job of evaluation as more of a cooperative effort between teacher and principal. It is apparent to principals that the future will bring many vital changes and provide a continuous program of experimentation and evaluation of new approaches to curriculum development.

Hypothesis VI

Principals will have to establish professional competence in order to assume the role of educational leader.

This hypothesis deals with the leadership role of the principal. The data collected tends to support this hypothesis.

It assumes that the principal will have to prove himself worthy of his position in order to acquire his leadership. Many teachers no longer accept the authority of office principle that some administrators rely on to acquire their leadership. Based on the results of the interviews and the contents of professional literature, this hypothesis can be accepted.

Strong feelings of agreement were expressed by principals with items that suggested principals would need to exhibit knowledge of their profession, have the ability to work with people in a professional manner, and prove themselves worthy of leading other professionals. Principals are aware that there will be a greater demand for competence to exercise instructional leadership.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The elementary school principal of the future must have a far greater understanding of his staff and people in the community. He will need to improve his human relations skills in order to work more effectively with these groups. Good public relations is becoming significantly more important as conflicts arise and pressure groups seek to attain their own particular goals.

An analysis of the results of the interviews tends to show definite concern by the principals regarding various aspects of their changing roles. The degree of concern varies with each aspect examined in this study. In general, principals agree that their roles are changing and they appear to be preparing to meet with this transition.

Principals did not approve of items that suggested their leadership will not have to be earned, such as, the

principal will be the leader because it is stated so in the board's policies.

Principals do not view their position as one of an "autocratic boss," but a position where they will direct, advise, work with and assist staff, and act as a liaison person. It was also felt that principals must be able to cope with change and the pressures of the times or they may find themselves out of touch with reality.

Recommendations

Modern educational programs are being affected by many trends and these influences must be considered in defining the role of the modern and future elementary school principal. As a result of this study the following recommendations are made:

1. Principals should actively participate in professional organizations for principals at the local, state and national levels. Principals should engage in committee work, hold office in these organizations and contribute to the professional literature.
2. Superintendents should consult more with principals with respect to developing policy and major planning

for the district. This combined effort will assure the principal that he is an integral part of the administrative team.

3. Superintendents and principals should jointly develop a more clearly defined outline of the principal's duties and responsibilities.
4. Principals should be knowledgeable of the special competencies in realizing the educational goals of their school. Principals should find more ways to make cooperative decisions with their staff.
5. Principals must exhibit competence in the consideration of ideas and their applicability to the problems and purposes of the school. Principals must also be given the authority commensurate with their responsibilities.
6. In planning programs for the training of school administrators, emphasis should be placed upon the "human relations" aspect of the principalship.

Suggestions for Further Study

The role of the elementary principal is a demanding and challenging one. Based on the conclusions reached in this

study, there is a need to determine if the findings of this study would hold true for a larger, more representative group of principals.

Because the role of the principal has many facets, several questions remain unanswered. These questions suggest possibilities for further research. The following questions are offshoots of this study and are offered for possible investigation:

1. What can an organization like the Illinois Elementary School Principals Association do to improve the status and image of the principal?
2. How is centralization and decentralization affecting the principal's role?
3. How do board members, superintendents and teachers perceive the role of the principal?
4. What can board members and superintendents do to enhance the stature of the principalship?
5. How effective has organizing been in districts where principals have affiliated either professionally or with a union?
6. What is the primary purpose of the principal?

The role of the principal will be subject to continuous study and revision to remain current and appropriate for the changing times. In closing, the following quotation is relevant.

Yesterday's schools are not good enough for today's needs, and it is equally certain that this year's school and this year's school administrator are not going to be good enough for the times we are moving into. To fill his office, literally and figuratively, a school principal must be able to do more than handle a bag of age old tricks.¹

¹David B. Austin, "Thoughts and Predictions on the Principalship", National Association of Secondary School Principals, December, 1968, p. 141.

APPENDIX A

PROPOSITIONS TO TEST HYPOTHESES

Please select one of the five alternatives and briefly state the reason for your particular choice:

1. As individuals, principals will have little effect on influencing their future roles.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-----------	----------	----------------------

2. Principals feel inadequate when carrying out their duties and responsibilities because the definition of their role is not clear.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

3. Principals will be more effective if they include the staff in formulating policy.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

4. Principals would feel more secure in their roles if superintendents and school boards were more sure of the status of the principal.

Strongly					Strongly
Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree

5. Teachers are being more adequately trained to assume complete responsibility for their total classroom performance.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

6. Principals should not pretend to be instructional experts, but should be concerned with getting experts and what to do with them.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

7. The power of the principals will diminish if they fail to organize.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

8. Superintendents include principals in the decision-making process to determine district policy.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

9. Teachers and principals should make a concerted effort to join hands to strengthen the position of the principal.

Strongly					Strongly
Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree

10. In order to clarify their position, principals must decide whether they are on the side of management or on the side of teachers.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

11. The knowledge gap between principals and teachers will become so great that the principal will be ill qualified to evaluate his staff.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

12. Principals will assume the leadership role based on the authority of office.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

13. Principals are only called to help develop policy when there is a crisis.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

14. Principals should have the prerogative to organize a locally sponsored professional organization to represent their most immediate concerns.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-----------	----------	----------------------

15. Principals will be one of the most influential groups in the future educational scheme.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

16. Teachers do not have a broad enough view of the educational program to partake in developing policy.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

17. Principals know what role they should assume; it is the district level administration that is unsure.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

18. Principals should not evaluate staff members who have better formal preparation in their academic fields.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

19. The principal's leadership role will be directly related to his ability to perform in his building.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

20. Many problems we have today with teachers is a result of giving them too much say in running the educational program.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-----------	----------	----------------------

21. Board of Education settlements with teachers will determine the future role of the principal.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

22. Principals will utilize other personnel to evaluate staff.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

23. Teachers no longer fear authority but respect ability.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

24. Principals are taking positive steps to increase the influence of their position.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

25. Principals are in a position to work with all groups to establish district policies.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

26. Principals will always make the major decisions on implementing policy and operating the building.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-----------	----------	----------------------

27. Principals do not have enough time to adequately evaluate the staff.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

28. Principals are making an effort to improve their image.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

29. Negotiations will have a great impact on the principal's role.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

30. The Board of Education alone cannot negotiate in the best interest of principals.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

31. Principals should actively participate in the negotiation process to prevent having their powers bargained away.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

32. Principals could lose control of their staff if they assume a partnership relationship with teachers.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-----------	----------	----------------------

33. The principal is being forced into a position of middle management.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

34. The principal's leadership role is determined by the staff and how willing they are to let him lead.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

35. Educational power is shifting from administration to teacher's groups.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

36. If present trends continue, principals will be little more than figureheads in the future.

SA	A	U	D	SD
----	---	---	---	----

In closing, I would appreciate your relating some of your personal feelings regarding the changing role of the principal.

APPENDIX B

PROMINENT EDUCATORS

Roald T. Campbell, Dean of the Graduate School, University of Chicago.

Ralph E. Clabaugh, Former Illinois Superintendent.

Luvern L. Cunningham, Director, Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago.

John Desmond, President, Chicago Teachers' Union.

Fenwick English, Projects Director, Temple City School District, California.

Benjamin Epstein, Assistant Superintendent, Newark, New Jersey, Public Schools.

Donald Erickson, Professor, University of Chicago.

James Harmon, Assistant Superintendent, Park Hill.

Robert M. Hutchins, President, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, California.

Arthur J. Lewis, Department Chairman, Columbia University.

Harold J. McNally, Professor, University of Wisconsin.

George B. Redfern, Associate Secretary of the American Association of School Administrators.

Stephen A. Romine, Dean of the College of Education, University of Colorado.

Raymond E. Schultz, Professor, Florida State University.

Robert L. Sinclair, Assistant Professor, University of
Massachusetts.

William Wayson, Assistant Professor, Syracuse University.

Thomas Wood, Executive Secretary, California Elementary
School Administrators Association.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. BOOKS

- American Association of School Administrators. Professional Administrators for America's Schools. Washington, D.C.: A.A.S.A., 1960.
- Cannell, Charles F., and Kahn, Robert L. The Dynamics of Interviewing. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1957.
- Department of Elementary School Principals Association. The Elementary School Principalship in 1968. Washington, D.C.: D.E.S.P.A., N.E.A., 1968.
- , The Elementary School Principalship, Seventh Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals, 1938.
- Getzels, Jacob W. "Administration as a Social Process." Administrative Theory in Education. Edited by Andrew W. Halpin. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1958.
- Gross, Neal. Staff Leadership in Public Schools. New York, London, Sydney: John Wiley and Sons, 1965.
- Linton, Ralph. The Study of Man. New York: Appleton-Century Co., 1936.
- Reich, Jerome R. "The Principalship: A Brief History." Perspectives of the Changing Role of the Principal. Compiled by Richard W. Saxe.
- Saxe, Richard W. "Perspectives on the Changing Role of the Principal." The Principalship: A Brief History. Compiled by Jerome R. Reich. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1968.

II. PERIODICALS

- Anderson, Robert C. "The Guided Interview as an Evaluative Instrument." Journal of Educational Research, Vol. XLVIII, November, 1954.
- Carver, Fred D. "Eroding Power Bases of the School Principal." Illinois Elementary Principal, May, 1969.
- Clabaugh, Ralph E. "A Superintendent Looks at Negotiations." Education Age, September-October, 1968.
- Cronin, Joseph H. "School Board and Principals--Before and After Negotiations." Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX, No. 3, November, 1967.
- Crosby, Muriel. "Impacts on Today's Schools." Educational Leadership, Vol. XXVI, No. 1:7, October, 1968.
- Crossfield, Ruth. "The Changing World of the Principal." National Elementary Principal, Vol. XLVII, No. 5, April, 1968.
- Cunningham, Luvern L. "Continuing Professional Education for Elementary Principals." The National Elementary Principal, Vol. XLIV, No. 5, April, 1965.
- Desmond, John. Chicago Principals Club Reporter, LVII, No. 4, Summer, 1968.
- English, Fenwick. "The Ailing Principalship." Phi Delta Kappan, L, No. 3, November, 1968.
- Epstein, Benjamin. Education U.S.A. Newsletter, March 10, 1969.
- Erickson, Donald A. "Forces for Change in the Principalship." The Elementary School Journal, November, 1964.
- , "Changes in the Principal." The National Elementary Principal, Vol. XLIV, No. 5:16, April, 1965.

- Green, Marion. "Elementary Principal's Job." School and Community, January, 1968.
- Harmon, James J. "The Principal's Role in a Changing Power Structure." School and Community, November, 1968.
- Houts, Paul. "Professional Negotiations." National Elementary Principal, February, 1968.
- Illinois Elementary School Principals Association. "The Role of the Elementary School Principal." A Position Paper, Fall, 1965.
- Illinois Principals' Coordinating Council, 1968.
- Langer, John H. "The Emerging Principalship in Michigan." Phi Delta Kappan, XLVIII, No. 4, December, 1966.
- Lewin, David. "The Changing Role of the Urban Principal." Elementary School Journal, April, 1968.
- Lewis, Arthur J. "The Future of the Elementary School Principalship." National Elementary Principal, September, 1968.
- McAulay, John D. "The Elementary Principal: Anachronism or What?" Education Age, March-April, 1969.
- McClure, Worth. "The Functions of the Elementary School Principal." Elementary School Journal, XXI, 513.
- McNally, Harold. "The American Principal Tomorrow." National Elementary Principal, XLVII, No. 6, May, 1968.
- Moody, Harold. "Plight of Principal." The Clearing House, May, 1968.
- Redfern, George B. "Negotiations Change Principal-Teacher Relationship." The National Elementary Principal, XLVII, No. 5, April, 1968.
- , "Court Decisions: The School Administrators Dilemma." Educational Leadership, XXVI, No. 3, December, 1968.

- Redfern, George B. "Improving Principal-Faculty Relationships." Successful School Management Series, 1966.
- Romine, Stephen A. "Current Influences Changing the Principal's Role." North Central Association Quarterly, Vol. XLII, Fall, 1967.
- Sinclair, Robert L. "Leadership Concerns." The National Elementary Principal, XLVIII, No. 1, September, 1968.
- Smith, James H. "The Principalship--Past, Present, and Future." The Chicago Principalship Club Reporter, LVII, No. 4, Summer, 1968.
- Stanavage, John A. "Educational Leader: An Authentic Role." National Association of Secondary School Principals, LI, November, 1967.
- United States Department of Interior. The Elementary School Principalship, by Bess Goodykoontz, Office of Education Bulletin 1938, No. 8, 1940.
- Wayson, William W. "The Elementary Principalship--Will It Be Part of the New Administration?" The National Elementary Principal, XLIV, No. 5, April, 1965.
- Wood, Thomas. "The Changing Role of the Teacher--How Does It Affect the Role of the Principal." The National Elementary Principal, XLVII, No. 5, April, 1968.

III. UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

- Crotts, John Herbert. "A Comparison and an Analysis of the Concepts of the Role of the Elementary School Principal." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Missouri, 1963.
- Fearing, Joseph Lea. "Principal-Faculty Perceptions of Certain Common and Observable Role Behaviors of the Elementary School Principal." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Colorado State College, 1963.

- Gray, Martin. "A Role Analysis of the School Principalship." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1961.
- Latimer, Lowell Francis. "The Role of the Elementary School Principal as Perceived by the Faculty and Principal Through Selected Role Behaviors." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Dakota, 1966.
- Melton, Joseph. "Perceptions of the Ideal and Actual Role of the Elementary School Principalship." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, 1958.
- Morgan, Stanley Roy. "The Public School Principalship: Role Expectations by Relevant Groups." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Utah, 1965.
- Muse, Ivan David. "The Public School Principalship: Role Expectations by Alter Groups." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Utah, 1966.
- Petrie, Garth Franklin. "A Study of the Elementary Administrator's Role." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1965.
- Schroeder, William Arthur. "The Principal and Teacher Militancy in Selected Indiana Cities." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1968.
- Seymour, Harry Jr. "A Study of Ideal and Actual Curriculum Role Conceptions of Selected Elementary School Principals from Southern Illinois." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1963.
- Snyder, Willard Sheilds. "The Elementary School Principals Perceptions of His Ideal and Actual Role." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, United States International University, 1968.
- Thompson, Lloyd Robert. "Principals' Perceptions of Changes in Their Role Resulting from Unification." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1966.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Edward Thomas Rancic has been read and approved by three members of the Department of Education.

The final copies have been examined by the Director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval with reference to content, form, and mechanical accuracy.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education.

January 16, 1970
Date


Signature of Advisor